DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 477 SO 011 557

AUTHOR Drucker, Eugene H.

TITLE An Investigation of the Factors Affecting Moral Judgment of Marital Status and Family Size. Final Report.

INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE Aug 75
CONTRACT NIH-71-2410
NOTE 128p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Behavior; *Family (Sociological Unit); Family Attitudes; Family Income; *Marital Status; Moral Values; Research Methodology; Social Attitudes; Social Factors; *Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study of how certain factors influence peoples' attitudes about other peoples' marital status and family size. For the study, stories were prepared describing single or married persons and families with different numbers of children. The stories contained information believed likely to affect the readers' attitudes or moral judgments about characters in the stories. Over 1,000 participants were asked to read the stories and judge the degree to which the person or family deserved praise or blame. Respondents also described their perceptions of the persons or families on an interpersonal perception scale. Results indicated that families with two children received the most praise. Moral judgments of family size were affected by the family's reported income, but not by the wife's work status. High income families with one or two children were praised for having another child, but low income families were blamed. Families with no children were seen as patient and intelligent, but lacking in warmth and happiness. Judgments of marital status were affected primarily by marital intent and parental pressure. Both married and single persons in the stories were praised by respondents for acting in accordance with their intentions. Married and single women who conformed to parental pressure were blamed, while those who did not conform were praised. (Author/AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

HumRRO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED167477

Final Report

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING MORAL JUDGMENT OF MARITAL STATUS AND FAMILY SIZE

by

Eugene H. Drucker

August 1975

Prepared for:
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
Department of Health Education and Welfare
Contract No. NIH 71-2140

SO 011 557

Human Resources Research Organization
HumRRO Central Division-Louisville Office
1939 Goldsmith Lane
Louisville, Kentucky 40218

FR-CD(L) 75-4

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is a nonprofit corporation established in 1969 to conduct research in the field of training and education. It was established as a continuation of The George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office. HumRRO's general purpose is to improve human performance, particularly in organizational settings, through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation.

This material has been prepared for review by appropriate organizational or sponsor agencies, or to record research information on an interim basis.

The contents do not necessarily reflect the official opinion or policy of the Human Resources Research Organization, and their preparation does not indicate endorsement by the Organization's contracting agencies.

Human Resources
Research Organization
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Va. 22314

PREFACE

This report described the results of a study conducted by the Human Resources Research Organization for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The purpose of the study was to examine the factors affecting moral judgments of marital status and family size, and to determine how these factors affect social pressures and interpersonal perceptions.

The research was performed by the Louisville Office of the HumRRO Central Division. Mr. Eugene H. Drucker, the Project Director, was assisted in the conduct of the study by Ms. Dorothy C. Herbert and Ms. Charlotte L. Heinecke.

Special thanks are due to the various schools and churches in Louisville, Kentucky that made the study possible by cooperating in data collection. These include the Jefferson County Board of Education, (Valley High School and Doss High School), Louisville Catholic Board of Education (DeSales High School, Bishop David High School, and Holy Rosary Academy), University of Louisville, Jefferson Community College, Beth Haven Christian School, Christ Church Cathedral, St. Williams Church, Our Savior Lutheran Church and University of Louisville Ecumenical Center.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	5
METHOD	15
SAMPLE	15
PROCEDURE	16
MATERIALS	17
Family Size Stories	17
Female Marital Status Stories	19
Male Marital Status Stories	20
Stories Concerning the Desire for an Additional Child	21
Moral Judgment Scale	22
Social Pressure Scale	23
Interpersonal Perception Scale	24
Biographical Information Questionnaire	24
DESIGN AND DATA ANALYSIS	25
RESULTS	26
FAMILY SIZE	26
Moral Judgment	26
Social Pressure	39
Interpersonal Perceptions	42
ADDITIONAL CHILD	45
Moral Judgment	45
Social Pressure	55
Interpersonal Perceptions	58
FEMALE MARITAL STATUS	61
Moral Judgment	61
Social Pressure	64
Interpersonal Perception	69

Page

MALE MARITAL STATUS. 69

Moral Judgment. 69
Social Pressure 77
Interpersonal Perceptions 79

DISCUSSION. 82

MORAL JUDGMENT OF FAMILY SIZE. 82

MORAL JUDGMENT OF MARITAL STATUS 95

SOCIAL PRESSURE AND FAMILY SIZE. 98

SOCIAL PRESSURE AND MARITAL STATUS 102

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS AND FAMILY SIZE. 105

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS OF MARITAL STATUS. 106

SUMMARY 108

REFERENCES. 113

APPENDIX. 115

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RELIGION. . . . 15

TABLE 2. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY INCOME, WIFE'S WORK STATUS, AND CONFIDENCE IN SCIENCE 27

TABLE 3. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY FAMILY INCOME. 29

TABLE 4. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY RELIGION AND AGE OF RESPONDENT . . 31

TABLE 5. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS . . 34

TABLE 6. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY INCOME, WIFE'S WORK STATUS, AND CONFIDENCE IN SCIENCE 40

TABLE 7. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY FAMILY INCOME. 42

Page

TABLE 8. MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN. 43

TABLE 9. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, SEX OF CHILDREN, AND INCOME 46

TABLE 10. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, AGE OF RESPONDENT AND SEX OF RESPONDENT. 49

TABLE 11. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS 51

TABLE 12. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, SEX OF CHILDREN, AND INCOME. 56

TABLE 13. MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN . . 60

TABLE 14. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY ATTRACTIVENESS, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE 61

TABLE 15. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY MARITAL INTENT AND PARENTAL PRESSURE 63

TABLE 16. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY ATTRACTIVENESS, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE 65

TABLE 17. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY MARITAL INTENT AND ATTRACTIVENESS. 67

TABLE 18. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND UNMARRIED FEMALES BY MARITAL INTENT, PARENTAL PRESSURE, AND RELIGION OF RESPONDENT. 68

TABLE 19. MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES. 70

TABLE 20. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY STABILITY, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE 71

TABLE 21. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY STABILITY; BY MARITAL INTENT; AND BY PARENTAL PRESSURE. 73

Page

TABLE 22. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY AGE OF RESPONDENT. 75

TABLE 23. MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY MARITAL INTENT AND SEX OF RESPONDENT 77

TABLE 24. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND UNMARRIED MEN BY STABILITY, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE 78

TABLE 25. MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MALES BY MARITAL INTENT AND RELIGION OF RESPONDENT. . . 79

TABLE 26. MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MALES. 80

INTRODUCTION

Moral judgment can be defined as the attribution of praise or blame for personal conduct or behavior not dictated by environmental circumstances. Among the many behaviors that are subject to these judgments are those related to marriage and family formation. People are frequently judged for their decision to get married or to remain single. Married couples are frequently judged for the number of children they happen to have or the decision to have another child. If the behaviors being judged correspond to the values or expectations of the judge, then the judgments presumably will involve various degrees of praise. If the behaviors violate the values or expectations of the judge, then the judgments presumably will involve various degrees of blame.

The moral judgment of marriage and family formation is especially significant because of its consequences on population growth and stability. To the extent that personal behavior is influenced by these judgments, moral judgments can lead to a greater number of marriages and to more children than are required to maintain the population at the present level. On the other hand, they can also lead to a reduction in the number of marriages and to a decrease in the number of children being born. Thus, moral judgment can have both negative and positive effects on population.

Perhaps the earliest scientific research concerned with moral judgment was performed by Piaget (1948) who developed a technique to measure the dynamics underlying these judgments. Using children as his subjects, Piaget read pairs of stories to each child. One story in each

pair described an event resulting in relatively large damage even though the basic intentions were honorable. The other story described an event resulting in relatively little damage, but the basic intentions were dishonorable. The subjects were required to listen to these two stories and to judge which one described the naughtier person. Piaget observed that the younger children responded in terms of absolute damage, while the older children responded in terms of underlying intentions. In conjunction with other evidence, Piaget concluded that moral development in children occurs in two stages. During the first stage, which Piaget called the heteronomous stage, moral judgments are based on objective criteria. During the second stage, or autonomous stage, moral judgments are based on subjective criteria. Thus, Piaget concluded that children judge the behavior of others during the heteronomous stage according to the degree to which behavior conforms to specified rules. During the autonomous stage, behavior would be judged according to the motivation behind the action being judged.

Kohlberg (1963) has more recently studied moral development using a method somewhat similar to that used by Piaget. Kohlberg presented to his subjects stories containing conflicts between obedience to social rules or commands from authority on the one hand, and human needs or the welfare of individuals on the other hand. The subjects were asked to select the appropriate action that should be taken in each situation and to justify the decision. The responses were then scored by judges who placed them into one of several categories representing different levels of moral reasoning. In contrast to the two stages identified by Piaget, Kohlberg was able to identify six stages of moral development. In the

most primitive of these six stages, moral judgments were based on cultural labels of "good" or "bad" in order to avoid punishment. At the highest level of moral development, moral judgments were based on an acceptance of universal abstract concepts.

In a study of the dynamics involved in moral judgment, Schultz and Dillehay (1970) presented their subjects with four stories describing the actions of individuals. The descriptions differed in the amount of effort being exerted to perform a task and in the outcome of these efforts. After reading the stories, the subjects were asked to judge these individuals by indicating on a scale the extent to which each person deserved to be praised or blamed. While effort was found to affect moral judgments, outcome had no effect. In contrast to the developmental approach taken by Piaget and Kohlberg, Schultz and Dillehay were concerned primarily with the factors affecting moral judgments.

Before moral judgments of marital status and family size can affect population, they must first influence individual behavior. To some extent, the moral judgments that an individual makes may affect that person's own behavior. According to dissonance theory, for example, there is a tendency in people to maintain a consistent relationship between different cognitions (Festinger, 1957). Thus, the knowledge that a person is behaving in a certain manner should be consistent with that person's beliefs, attitudes, or moral judgments. If a given individual feels that it is praiseworthy to get married and to have six children, then it would follow that there would be a tendency for this individual also to get married and to have six children. While there may be many factors that prevent the person from actually doing so, the tendency to behave in this manner may exist nevertheless.

A more potent mechanism, however, may be social pressures emanating from others. The potential force of these pressures was clearly demonstrated in the classic study by Asch (1951) in which subjects were found to submit to the judgments of others even when their own perceptions of reality clearly demonstrated the erroneous nature of these other judgments. Griffith (1973) has recently found that 78% of the respondents in a national probability sample believed that their parents or other close relatives would attempt to influence them to have a child if they were childless. About two out of every three respondents also believed that their friends would urge them to have a child. These expectations of social pressures were not limited to the condition of presumed childlessness. About two out of three men in the sample and three out of four women expected similar pressures from parents or relatives if they had only one child; about one-half of the men in the sample and two-thirds of the women expected social pressures from their friends. The respondents also expected social pressures to limit the size of their families if the number of children became too large. Just over one-half of the male respondents and almost three-fourths of the female respondents expected such pressures from parents or close relatives if they were expecting a fifth child; about half of the men and two-thirds of the women expected similar pressures from their close friends.

In all likelihood, the friends or relatives of a married couple would not attempt to influence their behavior unless the present behavior was first judged to be blameworthy and an alternative praiseworthy behavior existed. Once these conditions were met, however, the resulting social pressures conceivably could have a significant effect on their childbearing behavior.

Moral judgments of marital status or family size are not apt to be formulated in an abstract manner. In addition to the knowledge of the marital status or family size of the person being judged, a great deal of other information is available to the judge that may be taken into account in formulating the moral judgment. For example, when making a moral judgment of a couple for having no children, the judge will probably be aware of the couple's intentions regarding children, their income level, as well as numerous other factors that may play an important role in determining family size. When judging a girl who is still unmarried, the judge will probably be aware of her ability to attract a husband and her intentions regarding marriage. In formulating the moral judgments, some or all of these sources of information may be taken into account, although there is no assurance that different judges who assess the same behavior will consider the same factors or assign them the same level of importance.

Factors that do not have a direct bearing on the behavior being judged may also affect these judgments. The race or occupation of an unmarried girl may affect the judgments of her marital status even though they are not necessarily the causes of her behavior regarding marriage.

PURPOSE

In his discussion of the measurement of family-size norms, George (1973) defines a social norm as an ideal pattern of behavior that can serve as a criterion in judging the behavior of individuals provided that the behavior can be controlled by the individual being judged. Although

family-size norms provide the standards by which couples could be judged for their childbearing behavior, George states that other factors are also taken into consideration. In this manner, deviations from an ideal family size would be permitted. Thus, the family-size norm could be influenced by such factors as economic affluence and physical health.

While the concepts stemming from the moral judgment model are similar to those inherent in the social norm model, the research approaches resulting from the two sets of concepts differ somewhat. George acknowledges that many different questions have been written to assess the family-size norm. Mauldin, Watson, and Noe (1970) have identified twenty-six such questions, although George suggests the use of the question in its most simple form - "In your opinion what is the ideal number of children in a family." While questions of this sort may be useful in identifying a family-size norm or in measuring the deviations around the norm, they require respondents to make abstract judgments which they would not ordinarily make. To answer this type of question, respondents would first have to recall the types of reactions or judgments that they made in the past. Then they would have to estimate the particular family size that received the most favorable judgments. Since each judgment would be influenced by factors such as income and health, estimating the average judgment given to each family size could be a particularly difficult task. Even more important, however, the final response would provide little insight into the cognitive processes leading to the specification of an ideal family size. There would be no information available concerning either the factors that were normally taken

into account in judging the childbearing behavior of others, nor their importance in relation to each other.

These difficulties in measuring the ideal family size can be overcome by adopting the moral judgment model. Instead of asking a respondent to designate an ideal family size, descriptions of various families would be presented. The respondent would be asked to read each description and to judge each family. The stories would contain pertinent information such as the number of children in the family, their income, and whether or not the wife worked outside the home. By appropriate multivariate analysis, it would be possible not only to determine the effects of family size on moral judgment, but to assess the effects of other relevant information on these judgments.

The purpose of the present study is to use techniques stemming from the moral judgment model in order to determine how various factors influence judgments of marital status and family size. This would be accomplished by asking a sample of judges to read descriptions of single or married persons and descriptions of families with different numbers of children. The descriptions would contain information corresponding to each of the factors being investigated. After reading each story, the respondents would make a moral judgment of the person or family that was described based on the information contained in the description. Since it is assumed that moral judgments affect behavior primarily through resulting social pressures, the respondents would also be asked to indicate how they would attempt to influence the behavior of the person described in the story, if at all. It is assumed that the same factors affecting moral judgments would also affect the direction and magnitude of these attempts.

Another purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of marital status and family size on social perception. Assuming that perceptions of others are influenced by their marital status and family size, the persons described in the various stories should be perceived to have different personal characteristics. To determine the effects of marital status and family size on these perceptions, the respondents would also be asked to indicate their perceptions of the persons described in the stories.

To accomplish these objectives, four separate sets of descriptions or stories were prepared. One set described factors possibly affecting the moral judgment of family size. A second set of descriptions concerned factors possibly affecting the moral judgment of the decision to have an additional child. The remaining two sets described factors believed to affect the moral judgments of the marital status of a woman and the marital status of a man.

The group of stories concerned with family size described married couples having 0, 2, 4, or 6 children. Ryder and Westoff (1971) found that most people in their national sample considered two, three, or four children to be the ideal family size. The stories in this study included one family size representing a level below the ideal, one representing a level above the ideal, and two representing the ideal family size. It was expected that the families in the stories with 2 and 4 children would receive the most praise, while those with 0 and 6 children would receive the least praise.

The remaining factors that were included in these stories were the income of the families, whether or not the wife worked outside the home, and the family's confidence that science would eventually solve the problems created by overpopulation. It was assumed that the income of a family would have a significant effect on the moral judgments that were made and the subsequent social pressures that the family would receive. In particular, it was believed that low income families would be blamed less than high income families for having no children, while high income families would be blamed less than low income families for having six children. In order to assure that the income levels reported would be within the frame of reference of the respondents, they were selected to correspond to the estimated range of income of the respondents themselves. Thus, income levels of $6,000, $10,000, and $16,000 were incorporated into the stories, and subjects were recruited from areas assumed to be primarily middle class.

The wife's work status was also expected to influence moral judgment of family size. According to a study by Ridley (1959), an inverse relationship existed between the number of children a wife expected to have and the number of years she worked since getting married. Hoffman and Hoffman (1973), however, conclude from their review of the literature that employment is not an acceptable alternative to motherhood. While they acknowledge that employed women desire fewer children, on the average, than unemployed women, the desire for children by employed women is not eliminated. They also cited evidence implying that career success can be viewed as a threat to femininity. However, they also suggest that changing values may cause childless and one child families

to be more acceptable. To determine the effects of the wife's work status on moral judgments and subsequent social pressures, the wife described in these stories either worked outside the home or did not work outside the home.

The final factor incorporated into the stories stemmed from the increasing awareness of the ecological consequences of continued population growth. Essentially, it was felt that persons who believed that science would eventually solve these ecological problems would be blamed less for having large families than those who did not have this confidence in science. Similarly, it was expected that those who believed that science would never be able to solve these problems would be blamed less for having no children than those who did have confidence in science.

The second group of stories concerned families who were having another child because of their desire for an opposite sex child. It was believed that because of the tendency to prefer boys, families having an additional child because their desire for a son would be blamed less than those having an additional child because of their desire for a girl. Therefore, the families described in these stories either contained all boys or all girls.

While a major concern of this portion of the study was the effect of family size on the moral judgments made for having an additional child, the requirement that the children be of the same sex caused reasonable limits to be placed on the number of children these families could have. Since the likelihood of having more than four children of the same sex was relatively small, the maximum number of children described in these stories was four. The other stories described families with one, two, or three children.

Finally, in addition to differences in sex and family size, the families in these stories differed in family income. The families earned either $6,000 or $16,000.

The final two portions of the study were concerned with moral judgments of marital status. To determine what factors affect the moral judgment of marital status, stories were written describing married and single men and women. The factors examined in the stories concerning women were attractiveness, marital intent, and parental pressure. It was assumed that unattractive single women would receive less blame for being unmarried than attractive single women. Therefore, the stories described a woman who was either very attractive and had dated frequently, or one who was very unattractive and rarely dated.

It was also assumed that women who intended to remain single would receive more blame than women who desired to get married. If a woman desired to get married but was still single, factors beyond her control may have been responsible for her present marital status. Based on Piaget's finding that moral judgments during the autonomous stage are based on underlying intention, if single women are blamed more than married women, then those intending to remain single should be blamed more than those intending to get married. To test this hypothesis, the women described in the stories either wanted to get married or wanted to remain single.

Finally, the stories contained information regarding parental pressure. In order to determine whether or not moral judgments would be affected by the desire of the parents to have their daughter get married

or remain single, the parents described in the stories either discouraged or encouraged their daughter to get married.

The final portion of the study dealt with the marital status of a male. The factors that were contained within these stories were identical to those in the female version except that stability replaced attractiveness as a factor. It was believed that a man who was deemed unable to support a wife and family in comfort would be blamed less for remaining single than one who could support a wife and family. Therefore, the men in these stories were described either as having a history of academic and occupational successes, or else as having a history of failure.

While the stories would contain information on factors likely to affect moral judgments, various personal characteristics of the respondents also were expected to affect moral judgments. Several of these were investigated in the present study including the age, sex, and religion of the respondent. Because of changing attitudes toward family size and an increasing awareness by young people of the consequences of population growth, it was expected that younger persons would be more tolerant of small families and more critical of large families than older persons. It was also expected that younger persons would be less critical of persons who remained single. Therefore, the study focused upon respondents in three different age groups. The youngest group consisted of respondents who were 16-17 years of age. Since persons in this age group would soon become old enough to marry and have children, it was believed that they would be especially susceptible to social pressures and especially conscious of the marital plans of their peers.

The second group consisted of persons who were 18-19 years of age. It was expected that this group would not only be especially susceptible to the moral judgments and social pressures of others, but also that they would themselves be sources of these influences. Finally, the remaining group consisted of persons 20 years of age and older. While the largest number were in their twenties and thirties, this group included people of all ages including some in their sixties and seventies.

Studies on family size preferences have shown that women want more children, on the average, than men. Nobbe and Okraku (1974) have summarized the results of several of these studies in which it was shown that differences in family size preference ranged from .2 to .7 depending on the religion of the respondent. Based on these results, it would be expected that women would be more likely than men to praise large families and less likely to praise small families. To test for these differences, both male and female respondents were included in the present study.

Studies have also shown that Catholics prefer larger families than Protestants. Westoff and Potvin (1967) found, for example, that Catholic women in their sample desired an average of 5.4 children compared to an average preference of 3.5 for Protestant women. It was expected, therefore, that Catholic respondents would tend to praise large families more than non-Catholic respondents and would be more apt to blame small families. The sample used in the present study, therefore, contained equal numbers of Catholics and Protestants. While the sample also contained some persons who professed other religions or no religion at all, the judgments of these persons were not examined separately.

In addition to these characteristics, the experience of the respondents with large or small families was also expected to influence moral judgments of family size. The respondents were therefore asked to indicate both the number of brothers and sisters they had, and the number of children they had, if any. It was expected that persons from larger families would be more likely to praise others having large families. Similarly, it was expected that those from smaller families would be more likely to praise others having small families.

The number of children the respondents wanted to have or expected to have was also judged likely to affect their moral judgments. Those wanting or expecting large families would probably tend to praise others for having large families, while those wanting or expecting small families would probably tend to praise others for having small families. Therefore, questions were included to determine how many children each respondent wanted and how many each actually expected to have.

METHOD

SAMPLE

The participants in this study were 1,134 persons residing in Louisville, Kentucky. They ranged in age from 16 to 76 years. Table 1 summarizes the number of participants by sex, age, and religion. The sample was obtained with the cooperation of various public schools, parochial schools, colleges, and churches located in Louisville. The research materials were administered from December 1974 through March 1975 to groups ranging in size from approximately 5 to 150 persons.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RELIGION

CHARACTERISTICS	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
SEX	
Male	580
Female	548
Unknown	6
AGE	
16-17	536
18-19	306
20+	287
Unknown	5
RELIGION	
Protestant	506
Catholic	506
Jewish	11
None	80
Other	9
Unknown	22

In order to control for the effects of socio-economic status on moral judgments, the sample was selected from schools and churches primarily in middle class areas. To identify any participants who may not have had middle class backgrounds, questions were included in a Background Information Questionnaire pertaining to family income and education of parents. Because many persons either omitted these questions or else stated that they lacked the requested information, all participants were included in the final sample regardless of their responses to these questions. Since the sample was obtained in primarily middle class locations, it can be assumed that it adequately represents the middle class residents of Louisville.

PROCEDURE

After being given a brief explanation of the general nature of the project, each participant received a booklet distributed on a random basis. Each booklet contained six stories and the Background Information Questionnaire. Following each story were a moral judgment scale, a social pressure scale, and an interpersonal perception scale. To increase the likelihood of obtaining independent responses, each story and each scale appeared on a separate page of the booklet.

After the instructions were read aloud, questions were answered. The respondents were then asked to read the six stories and to answer the questions following each. There were no time limits imposed upon the participants, although most completed the materials within 30 minutes.

MATERIALS

Family Size Stories. Each booklet contained three stories describing families with 0, 2, 4, or 6 children. The first sentence in each story presented the name of the married couple, the number of children in the family, the fact that the couple had been married for 12 years, and their family income. The three income levels of $6,000, $10,000 and $16,000 were selected to represent the approximate bottom, middle, and top income levels of middle-class families residing in Louisville at the time the study was planned. In addition to the statement of income, a general description was included of the life style of each family. The purpose of this description was to increase the salience of the reported income for the respondent. Thus, the following statement was made in each story concerning a family earning $6,000:

> "Mr. and Mrs. Smith.....barely manage to live on their $6,000 income."

The following description was made in each story concerning a family earning $10,000:

> "Mr. and Mrs. Jones.....manage to live somewhat comfortably on their $10,000 income."

Finally, the following description was made in each story concerning a family earning $16,000:

> "Mr. and Mrs. Miller.....live quite comfortably on their $16,000 income."

The second sentence in each family size story concerned the wife's work status. The sentence told whether or not the wife worked outside the home and contained a brief statement regarding her philosophy toward the role of the wife in the family. The following sentence appeared in each story in which the wife worked:

"Mrs.....feels that it is important for a married woman like herself to get out of the house, so she works outside the home."

The following sentence appeared in each story in which the wife did not work:

"Mrs.....feels that it is important for a married woman like herself to stay at home and take care of the house, so she does not work outside the home."

Finally, each family size story contained in a separate paragraph a statement regarding the family's confidence in the likelihood that science would someday solve the ecological problems stemming from overpopulation. The more optimistic statement was as follows:

"Both Mr. and Mrs.....are aware that population contributes to overcrowding and environmental pollution, but they are sure that scientists will solve these problems just as they solved other difficult problems in the past."

The following statement appeared in the description of the more pessimistic family:

"Both Mr. and Mrs.....are aware that population contributes to overcrowding and environmental pollution, and they doubt that scientists will ever be able to solve these problems even though they solved other difficult problems in the past."

There were 48 different family size stories representing all possible combinations of family size, income, wife's work status, and confidence in science. Since each booklet contained three family size stories, 16 different sets of booklets were prepared. No level of family size or income appeared more than once in a single booklet. However, because the design included only two levels each of wife's work status and confidence in science, it was necessary to repeat one of the levels of work status and one of the levels of confidence in science within each booklet.

Female Marital Status Stories. The fourth story in each booklet described a girl who either recently got married or who was still single. The girl was described as being 28 years of age since it was assumed that most people would feel that a single girl at this age was unlikely to get married if she waited much longer. The first sentence in each story described her attractiveness and frequency of dates. The attractive girl was described as having dated frequently, while the unattractive girl was described as having rarely dated. Thus, the statements were as follows:

> "Barbara, a very attractive 28 year old girl.....was one of the prettiest girls in her class when she was still in school, and she had lots of dates."

or

> "Barbara, a very unattractive 28 year old girl..... was one of the homeliest girls in her class when she was still in school, and she hardly ever had any dates."

Following the statement of attractiveness and dating frequency were statements of marital intent. The girl was described either as placing a high value on marriage, or else placing no value on it at all. Thus, the statements pertaining to marital intent were as follows:

> "She was always very interested in marriage. Finding a husband and having a family of her own were very important to her."

or

> "She was never very interested in marriage. Finding a husband and having a family of her own were just not important to her, and she preferred to remain single."

Finally, the stories contained a statement of parental pressure. The parents were described either as having encouraged her to get

married or as having discouraged her. The precise statements were as follows:

> "Her parents.....wanted her to get married since they felt she was a mature adult. They wanted her to have a home of her own and encouraged her to try to find a husband."

or

> "Her parents did not want her to get married..... since they could not accept the fact that Barbara was now grown up. They did not want her to leave home, and discouraged her from trying to find a husband."

There were a total of 16 female marital status stories representing all combinations of marital status, attractiveness, marital intent, and parental pressure. Each booklet contained one of these 16 stories.

Male Marital Status Stories. The fifth story in each booklet described a man who either was recently married or who was still single. The man was described as 34 years of age since it was assumed that most people would feel that a single man of this age was likely to remain single if he waited much longer. The first three sentences in each story described his stability and his potential for supporting a family. In the stories in which his potential was high, he was described as a stable person who earned good grades in school and who had no difficulty finding or keeping a job. In the stories in which his potential was low, he was described as an unstable person who earned poor grades in school and who had trouble finding and keeping a job. The following statements were included in the stories:

> "John, who is 34 years old....., was always a very stable sort of person. When he was still in high school, he worked very hard so that he could earn good grades. After he graduated, he had no difficulty finding or keeping a job, and most of the girls he knew felt that he would be able to support a family in comfort."

or

> "John, who is 34 years old....., was never a very stable sort of person. When he was still in high school, he earned poor grades and got into all sorts of trouble. After he quit school, he had trouble finding and keeping a job, and most of the girls he knew felt that he would never be able to support a family in comfort."

Following the statement of stability was the statement of marital intent. This statement was identical to that contained in the stories concerned with female marital status, with appropriate changes for sex. The final statements concerned parental pressure, and these, too, were identical to those contained in stories concerned with female marital status.

There were a total of 16 male marital status stories, representing all possible combinations of marital status, stability, marital intent, and parental pressure. Each booklet contained one of these 16 stories.

Stories Concerning the Desire for an Additional Child. The sixth story in each booklet described a family about to have an additional child. The families had one, two, three, or four children, all of the same sex. According to the stories, the family decided to have another child because of their desire for a child of the opposite sex.

The first sentence in each story contained a description of the family's income and their ability to support another child. Two income levels, $6,000 and $16,000, were chosen to represent the lower and upper ranges of income believed to be middle class incomes in Louisville at the time the study was planned. At the $6,000 income level, the statement was made that the family could not afford another child, while at the $16,000 level, the statement was made that they could easily afford to support more children. Thus, one of the following statements was contained in each story:

"Mr. and Mrs. Brown, who cannot afford to support any more children on their $6,000 income, are soon going to have another child."

or

"Mr. and Mrs. Brown, who can easily afford to support more children on their $16,000 income, are soon going to have another child."

The next sentence in the story described whether the family had one, two, three, or four children, and whether the children were boys or girls. The following statements are examples of those appearing in each story:

"The Browns already have one child -- a boy, but they decided to have another because they always wanted a daughter."

or

"The Browns already have two children -- both girls, but decided to have another because they always wanted a son."

There were a total of 16 stories representing all combinations of income, family size, and sex. Each booklet contained one of these 16 stories concerning the desire to have another child.

Moral Judgment Scale. Moral judgment was measured by means of a scale that appeared on the page immediately following each of the six stories. The scale, which was adapted from that used by Schultz and Dillehay (1970), contained seven positions which were labeled as follows:

Much Blame	Moderate Blame	Slight Blame	No Blame or Praise	Slight Praise	Moderate Praise	Much Praise

A statement above each scale described the specific behavior that was to be judged. For example, following the stories of families with no children, the instructions stated "FOR HAVING NO CHILDREN, THIS COUPLE

DESERVES." Following each story of an unmarried girl, the instructions stated "FOR NOT GETTING MARRIED, THIS WOMAN DESERVES." Subjects were instructed to place an "X" in the space that best showed their judgment.

Social Pressure Scale. Social pressure was measured by a scale that appeared on the page immediately following each moral judgment scale. The social pressure scale required the respondents to indicate how they would have tried to influence the behavior of the person or married couple described in the story. The scale consisted of seven statements describing the direction and magnitude of this influence. For example, the following statements comprised the social pressure scale following each family size story and each story concerned with the decision to have an additional child:

If I were a close friend or relative of this couple, I would have

___tried very hard to influence them to have more children.

___tried moderately hard to influence them to have more children.

___tried slightly hard to influence them to have more children.

___not tried to influence them at all.

___tried slightly hard to influence them to have no more children.

___tried moderately hard to influence them to have no more children.

___tried very hard to influence them to have no more children.

The following statements comprised the social pressure scale following each female marital status story, and with appropriate changes in pronouns, following each male marital status story:

If I were a close friend or relative of the woman, I would have:

___tried very hard to influence her to get married.

___tried moderately hard to influence her to get married.

___tried slightly hard to influence her to get married.

___not tried to influence her at all.

___tried slightly hard to influence her not to get married.

___tried moderately hard to influence her not to get married.

___tried very hard to influence her not to get married.

Interpersonal Perception Scale. The interpersonal perception scale consisted of 15 separate bipolar adjective scales using the semantic differential format developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). Each scale consisted of seven spaces that were labeled only at the two extreme locations. The labels for each scale represented opposite characteristics such as Intelligent-Unintelligent or Immature-Mature. The interpersonal perception scale, which followed each social pressure scale, is contained in the Appendix.

Biographical Information Questionnaire. The biographical information questionnaire consisted of 22 questions including those pertaining to the sex, age, and religion of the respondent. In addition, numerous other questions were included such as the number of brothers and sisters the respondents had, the number of children they wanted, the number of children they expected, and the number of children, if any, they actually had. The biographical information questionnaire is contained in the Appendix.

DESIGN AND DATA ANALYSIS

Each portion of the study represents a complete factorial design with two or more levels of each factor. The portion of the study dealing with family size, for example, consists of four levels of family size (0 children, 2 children, 4 children, and 6 children), three levels of income ($6,000, $10,000, and $16,000), two levels of the wife's work status (wife works outside the home, or wife does not work outside the home), and two levels of confidence in science (high confidence or low confidence). This design enables several factors to be investigated simultaneously within the same group of stories and provides information concerning the interaction between the different factors. Demographic data obtained from the respondents were also treated as factors in a factorial design.

The data were analyzed using analysis of variance (Winer, 1971). In only a few cases are main effect of interest, however. In the analysis of the family size stories, for example, there is an interest in the main effects for family size, but not for income, work status, and confidence in science. Since the major focus of the study was upon the effects of these factors on the moral judgment of family size, only their interactions with family size are discussed. Similarly, in the portions of the study dealing with marital status, the main effects for marital status would be reported. However, only the interactions of the remaining factors with marital status will be discussed.

When statistically significant effects were obtained, Newman-Keuls tests were performed to determine which means differed significantly (Winer, 1971).

RESULTS

FAMILY SIZE

Moral Judgment. The mean moral judgment scores for each family size story are contained in Table 2. Scores increasing in value from 4.00 indicate increasing amounts of praise, while scores decreasing in value from 4.00 indicate increasing amounts of blame. The average moral judgment scores ranged from 3.04 to 5.30. The most praise was received by families with two children, particularly those earning $10,000 or $16,000. In no single story was the family with two children blamed. Families with no children also tended to be praised. In only two of the twelve stories describing families with no children did the families fail to be praised at least slightly for having no children. The moral judgments of families with four children appeared to depend on the income of the families. All four families earning only $6,000 were blamed for having four children, while none of the families earning $10,000 or $16,000 were blamed. On the other hand, there was a strong tendency to blame families for having six children. Only one of the twelve families with six children failed to be blamed for having this number of children.

The analysis of variance resulted in a significant main effect for family size ($F = 128.06$, $df = 3/3354$, $p < .001$). The greatest amount of praise was received by families with two children ($\bar{X} = 4.72$), although families with no children also tended to be praised ($\bar{X} = 4.27$). While families with four children tended to be neither praised nor blamed overall ($\bar{X} = 3.96$), those with six children were blamed ($\bar{X} = 3.56$). The Newman-Keuls test showed that the differences between all pairs of means were statistically significant.

TABLE 2

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY INCOME, WIFE'S WORK STATUS, AND CONFIDENCE IN SCIENCE

INCOME	WIFE'S WORK STATUS	CONFIDENCE IN SCIENCE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
			0	2	4	6
$ 6,000	Works	High	4.47 (73)[a]	4.31 (67)	3.38 (69)	3.54 (67)
		Low	4.34 (74)	4.44 (71)	3.65 (63)	3.39 (70)
	Does not work	High	4.31 (72)	4.19 (67)	3.57 (67)	3.19 (74)
		Low	4.58 (77)	4.29 (73)	3.37 (76)	3.27 (71)
$10,000	Works	High	4.16 (71)	4.89 (64)	4.16 (70)	3.87 (75)
		Low	4.16 (76)	4.90 (67)	4.01 (71)	3.04 (69)
	Does not work	High	4.32 (69)	4.80 (77)	4.36 (73)	3.40 (72)
		Low	3.98 (68)	5.30 (74)	4.18 (67)	4.01 (74)
$16,000	Works	High	4.07 (71)	4.87 (75)	4.00 (73)	3.79 (70)
		Low	4.30 (74)	4.81 (67)	4.10 (77)	3.54 (63)
	Does not work	High	4.59 (69)	4.86 (74)	4.37 (71)	3.81 (68)
		Low	3.95 (62)	5.01 (75)	4.32 (72)	3.85 (73)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

The effects of the other factors on moral judgment were determined by examining their interactions with family size. A significant interaction was obtained between income and family size (F = 10.93, df = 6/3354, p <.001). The mean moral judgment scores for each income level are presented by family size in Table 3. While families with no children or two children were consistently praised at all levels of income, only the families earning $10,000 and $16,000 were praised for having four children. None of the families were praised for having six children regardless of income. While there were no significant differences across income levels among families with no children, the amount of praise received by the families with two children earning $10,000 and $16,000 was significantly more than that received by the families with two children earning only $6,000. A similar result occurred among families with four children. The families earning $10,000 and $16,000 received significantly higher moral judgment scores than those earning just $6,000. Among the families with six children, those earning $6,000 received significantly more blame than those earning $16,000. The amount of blame received by families earning $10,000 fell between that received by families earning $6,000 and $16,000, but did not differ significantly from either one.

The greater tolerance of larger families among those with higher incomes can be observed by examining the pattern of moral judgments as the number of children in the families increase from two to six. Among families earning both $10,000 and $16,000, moral judgment scores decrease significantly as the number of children increase from two to four and

again at they increase from four to six. The moral judgment scores for families earning $6,000 decreases signficantly as the number of children in the family increase from two to four, but not as they increase from four to six. In essence, the maximum amount of blame received by low income families is reached in families having only four children. While it cannot be determined from the present data at what number of children the asymptote is reached for higher income families, the number of children must be greater than four.

TABLE 3

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY FAMILY INCOME

INCOME	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	0	2	4	6
$ 6,000	4.42 (296)[a]	4.31 (278)	3.49 (275)	3.35 (282)
$10,000	4.16 (284)	4.97 (282)	4.18 (281)	3.58 (290)
$16,000	4.23 (276)	4.89 (291)	4.20 (293)	3.75 (274)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

In addition to the significant interaction between family size and income, two other significant interactions were obtained that included family size. One of these was a significant second order interaction between family size, wife's work status, and confidence in science (F = 6.06, df = 3/3354, p<.001), while the other was a significant third order

interaction between all of the factors included in the stories (F = 2.62, df = 6/3354, p<.05). Newman-Keuls tests were conducted in an attempt to decipher these interactions. The results showed that moral judgments of families with no children, two children, and four children were not affected by either the wife's work status or confidence in science. While these two factors did have an effect among families with six children, the effect only appeared among those families earning $10,000. At this income level, confidence in science had a significant effect in the stories where the wife worked outside the home. The families who had low confidence in science were blamed significantly more for having six children than those who had high confidence in science. At the same time, the wife's work status was found to have an effect if the family had low confidence in science. Families in which the wife worked received significantly lower moral judgment scores for having six children than families in which the wife did not work.

Because of computer program limitations, two analyses of variance were conducted to determine the effects of the respondents' age, sex, and religion on the moral judgments of family size. One analysis contained the sex and religion of the respondent as factors as well as three of the factors described in the stories - family size, income, and wife's work status. The second analysis included age as well as the three story factors. Significant interactions occurred between family size and religion (F = 16.86, df = 3/2931, p <.001) and between family size and age (F = 7.62, df = 6/3315, p <.001). The mean moral judgment scores for the different sized families by the religion and age of the respondent are contained in Table 4.

TABLE 4

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY RELIGION AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

RELIGION AND AGE OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	0	2	4	6
RELIGION				
Protestant	4.43 (301)[a]	4.73 (294)	3.81 (299)	3.26 (294)
Catholic	4.15 (463)	4.71 (463)	4.12 (457)	3.84 (456)
AGE				
16-17	4.16 (405)	4.71 (401)	4.16 (399)	3.82 (403)
18-19	4.36 (235)	4.75 (224)	3.81 (234)	3.32 (225)
20+	4.40 (214)	4.74 (221)	3.73 (212)	3.32 (214)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

Significant differences between the moral judgments made by Protestant and Catholic respondents occurred for families with no children, four children, and six children, but not for families with two children. Both Protestant and Catholic respondents tended to praise families with no children, but Protestants praised these families significantly more than Catholics. While Catholic respondents tended to praise slightly those families with four children, Protestant respondents tended to blame those families. Finally, both Protestant and Catholic respondents blamed families with six children, but Protestants blamed them significantly more than Catholics.

Families with two children were praised significantly more than those with any other number of children by both Protestants and Catholics.

While the moral judgment scores from Protestant respondents were significantly greater for families with no children than for families with four children, no difference appeared between the mean moral judgment scores obtained from Catholic respondents for these family sizes. However, the moral judgment scores from both Protestants and Catholics were significantly lower for families with six children than for families with just four children. Thus, there is a greater tendency among Protestants than Catholics to blame families for having large families, and a greater tendency among Protestants than Catholics to praise families with no children at all.

While respondents in all age groups praised families with either no children or two children, only the 16-17 year old respondents praised families with four children. The respondents in all three age groups, however, tended to blame families for having six children. While there were no significant differences between the age groups in their moral judgments of families with no children and two children, 16-17 year old respondents differed significantly from those in the two older groups in their judgments of families with four and six children. In both cases the moral judgments made by the 16-17 year old sample were more favorable than those made by the 18-19 year old sample or by those who were at least 20 years of age. The tendency of the youngest respondents to be more tolerant of larger families can also be seen by examining their pattern of judgments for different sized families. Repondents in all three groups praised families with two children significantly more than those having any other number of children. The moral judgment scores for the respondents in the two older groups then decrease

significantly for families with no children, and then decreased further for families with four and six children. While the moral judgment score for 16-17 year old respondents decreased significantly for families with no children, it did not decrease at all for families with four children. However, their scores did decrease significantly once again for families with six children.

Table 5 contains the mean moral judgment scores for each family size presented by the number of siblings the respondents had, the number of children they wanted, the number of children they expected, and for married respondents only, the number of children they actually had. Families with no children and those with two children were praised by respondents having different numbers of siblings, but families with four or six children were praised only by respondents with five or more siblings.

Interesting patterns emerged in the judgments of families with no children and those with four or six children. The moral judgment scores received by families with no children decreased as the number of siblings increased. However, the moral judgment scores received by families with four and six children show just the opposite pattern since they increased as the number of siblings increased. Thus it appears from examination of these scores that respondents from small rather than large families tend to be more tolerant of families with no children, while respondents from large rather than small families tend to be less critical of families with relatively large numbers of children. An analysis of variance of this data resulted in a significant interaction between family size and number of siblings ($F = 45.33$, $df = 9/3384$, $p < .001$). The Newman-Keuls test showed that families with no children

TABLE 5

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	0	2	4	6
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS				
0	4.76 (42)[a]	4.60 (48)	3.53 (38)	3.05 (43)
1-2	4.34 (296)	4.87 (291)	3.84 (302)	3.21 (297)
3-4	4.26 (279)	4.74 (271)	3.96 (279)	3.59 (277)
5+	4.11 (228)	4.53 (228)	4.17 (222)	4.06 (219)
NUMBER OF CHILDREN WANTED				
0	4.93 (45)	4.31 (49)	3.53 (47)	2.96 (45)
1-2	4.46 (411)	4.81 (414)	3.73 (410)	3.19 (411)
3-4	3.95 (225)	4.64 (215)	4.10 (218)	3.94 (231)
5+	4.01 (75)	4.86 (77)	4.87 (78)	4.58 (82)
NUMBER OF CHILDREN EXPECTED				
0	4.98 (49)	4.44 (54)	3.56 (48)	3.04 (47)
1-2	4.42 (391)	4.78 (389)	3.72 (390)	3.22 (391)
3-4	3.97 (206)	4.79 (199)	4.20 (203)	3.85 (210)
5+	4.19 (64)	4.87 (63)	4.85 (68)	4.62 (72)
NUMBER OF CHILDREN				
0	4.78 (9)	4.64 (11)	3.15 (13)	2.33 (9)
1-2	4.34 (50)	4.51 (51)	3.76 (46)	3.02 (48)
3-4	4.19 (37)	4.76 (37)	3.79 (38)	3.71 (41)
5+	3.94 (18)	4.65 (17)	4.25 (12)	4.12 (16)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

are praised significantly more by respondents with no siblings than by respondents with at least five siblings. None of the other differences between the mean moral judgment scores for families with no children was statistically significant. Similarly, none of the differences between the mean moral judgment scores for families with two children was statistically significant. Families with four children, however, received significantly lower scores from respondents with no siblings than from respondents with at least five siblings. Families with six children received significantly lower scores from respondents with no siblings than from those with either 3-4 siblings or five and more siblings. Families with six children also received lower scores from respondents with 1-2 siblings than from those with five and more siblings.

Examining the table in the other direction, the Newman-Keuls test also showed that the judgments made by respondents with five or more siblings do not differ significantly across family size. Respondents with 3-4 siblings, however, judged families with no children and those with two children significantly more favorably than they judged families with six children. They also judged families with just two children more favorably than those with four children. Respondents with only 1-2 siblings responded more favorably to families with two children than to families having any other number, and they responded more favorably to families with no children at all than to those with six children. Finally, respondents with no siblings responded significantly more favorably to families with either no children or two children than they did to families with either four or six children. They were also

more critical of families with six children than of those with four children. While these data show that there is a tendency for respondents from larger families to be less critical of others having large families, these large families are blamed, nevertheless, by all respondents except those having at least 5 brothers and sisters of their own.

Families with two children were praised by respondents wanting different numbers of children. While families with no children were praised by respondents wanting either no children or 1-2 children, they were not praised by respondents wanting 3-4 children or by those wanting at least five children. Families with four children were praised only by respondents wanting at least 3-4 children, while those with six children were praised by only those wanting five or more children themselves.

This pattern of scores is similar to that obtained when examining the judgments made by respondents with various numbers of siblings. Moral judgments of families with four and six children became increasingly favorable with increases in the number of children wanted by the respondents. The judgments of families with no children became less favorable with increases in the number of children wanted by the respondents, but only until the desired number of children reached 3-4. Beyond that point, moral judgment no longer became less favorable.

An analysis of variance of this data yielded a significant interaction between family size and number of children wanted ($F = 19.82$, $df = 3/3017$, $p < .001$). The Newman-Keuls test showed that families with no children received more praise from respondents who themselves want no children than from those who want 3-4 children or those who want at

least five children. On the other hand, families with two children were praised significantly less by respondents wanting no children than by respondents wanting 1-2 children or those wanting at least five children. Families with four and six children received significantly higher moral judgment scores from respondents wanting at least five children than from those wanting any other number of children. In addition, respondents wanting 3-4 children made more favorable judgments of families with four children than were made by respondents wanting no children. They also made more favorable judgments of families with six children than were made by respondents wanting no children at all or those wanting 1-2 children.

Respondents wanting no children of their own made significantly less favorable judgments of the different families as the number of children in these families increased. A similar trend was observed among respondents wanting 1-2 children, although it appeared only for families with two or more children. While respondents wanting 3-4 children reacted most favorably to families with two children, their judgments of families of other sizes did not differ significantly from each other. Finally, respondents wanting at least five children gave significantly less praise to families with no children than to families having any other number of children. Their judgments of families with two, four, and six children did not differ significantly, however.

When the data are examined by the number of children wanted by the respondents, they indicate that respondents wanting large families of their own are more apt to praise large families than respondents who want small families. On the other hand, those wanting small families

rather than large are apt to give more praise to families with no children.

Similar data patterns are observed when examining the judgments made by respondents expecting different numbers of children. The mean moral judgment scores received by families with four and six children increase as the respondents expect increasingly more children of their own. The scores received by families with no children decrease with an increase in the number of children expected by the respondent, but only until the respondent expects 3-4 children. Beyond that number the judgment becomes more favorable.

The analysis of variance of the data resulted in a significant interaction between family size and expected number of children (F = 15.30, df = 3/2828, p <.001). While families with no children were judged more favorably by respondents expecting no children of their own than by those expecting 3-4 children or by those expecting at least five children, the expected number of children had no effects on judgments of families with two children. Families with four and six children were judged more favorably by respondents expecting at least five children of their own than by respondents expecting any other number of children. These families were also judged more favorably by respondents expecting 3-4 children than by those expecting none at all. In addition, families with six children were judged more favorably by respondents expecting 3-4 children than by those expecting 1-2 children.

Respondents expecting no children of their own attributed praise for families with either no children or two children, but they blamed families with four or six children. Furthermore, they ascribed

significantly more blame to families with six children than to families with just four children. A similar pattern was observed in the judgments made by respondents expecting 1-2 children. Respondents expecting 3-4 children responded more favorably to families with two children than to those with any other number of children. Respondents expecting at least five children praised families of all different sizes, but they gave significantly less praise to families with no children than to those with two or four children.

The pattern of judgments obtained from married respondents with different numbers of children was very similar to those just described. Judgments of families with no children became increasingly less favorable as the respondents had more children of their own. On the other hand, their judgments of families with four and six children became more favorable as the number of children in their own families increased. The interaction obtained during the analysis of variance, however, was not statistically significant ($F = 2.56$, $df = 3/437$, $p > .05$). Comparisons between individual means, therefore, were not made.

Social Pressure. The mean social pressure scores for each family size are contained in Table 6. Scores decreasing in value from 4.00 indicate increasingly strong attempts to influence the families to have more children, while scores increasing in value from 4.00 indicate increasingly strong attempts to influence the families to have no more children. The mean social pressure scores received by families with no children show that the respondents would have attempted to influence these families to have children, while the scores received by families with two, four, and six children show that they would have attempted to influence these other families to have no more children.

TABLE 6

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY INCOME, WIFE'S WORK STATUS, AND CONFIDENCE IN SCIENCE

INCOME	WIFE'S WORK STATUS	CONFIDENCE IN SCIENCE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
			0	2	4	6
$6,000	WORKS	HIGH	3.70 (73)[a]	4.75 (67)	4.99 (69)	4.78 (67)
		LOW	3.84 (74)	4.46 (71)	4.84 (63)	4.74 (70)
	DOES NOT WORK	HIGH	3.76 (72)	4.51 (67)	4.72 (67)	4.96 (74)
		LOW	3.83 (77)	4.45 (73)	4.86 (76)	4.94 (71)
$10,000	WORKS	HIGH	3.49 (71)	4.22 (64)	4.46 (70)	4.61 (75)
		LOW	3.63 (76)	4.13 (67)	4.46 (71)	5.17 (69)
	DOES NOT WORK	HIGH	3.71 (69)	4.32 (77)	4.44 (73)	4.82 (72)
		LOW	3.54 (68)	4.12 (74)	4.40 (67)	4.61 (74)
$16,000	WORKS	HIGH	3.51 (71)	4.05 (75)	4.48 (73)	4.57 (70)
		LOW	3.49 (74)	4.09 (67)	4.69 (77)	4.98 (63)
	DOES NOT WORK	HIGH	3.80 (69)	4.10 (74)	4.44 (71)	4.88 (68)
		LOW	3.47 (62)	4.05 (75)	4.25 (72)	4.81 (73)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample sizes.

The analysis of variance resulted in a significant main effect for family size ($F = 217.37$, $df = 3/3354$, $p < .001$). While the mean social pressure score received by families with no children ($\bar{X} = 3.65$) indicates that the respondents would have attempted to influence them to have children, the mean score received by families with two children ($\bar{X} = 4.27$), four children ($\bar{X} = 4.59$), and six children ($\bar{X} = 4.82$) indicate that increasing amounts of pressure to have no more children would have been applied to families as family size increased.

The only significant interaction involving family size was a significant interaction between family size and income ($F = 2.94$, $df = 6/3354$, $p < .01$). The mean social pressure scores for each level of income are presented by family size in Table 7. While the respondents would have attempted to influence childless families at all income levels to have children, significantly stronger attempts would have been made to influence families earning $10,000 or $16,000 than those earning $6,000. Discrimination against low income families also appeared among families with two and four children. Significantly stronger attempts would have been made to influence families earning $6,000 to have no more children than those earning $10,000 or $16,000. However, there were no differences between the social pressure scores received by families with six children. The respondents would have attempted equally to influence all families with six children to have no more children regardless of their income level.

TABLE 7

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN BY FAMILY INCOME

INCOME	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	0	2	4	6
$ 6,000	3.78 (296)[a]	4.54 (278)	4.85 (275)	4.86 (282)
$10,000	3.59 (284)	4.20 (282)	4.44 (281)	4.80 (290)
$16,000	3.57 (276)	4.07 (291)	4.46 (293)	4.81 (274)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

Examined from another point of view, the data suggest that the amount of social pressure to influence the behavior of families earning $6,000 would reach its asymptote at four children. The amount of social pressure to influence the behavior of families earning $10,000 or $16,000 would not reach its asymptote until the families have at least six children.

No significant interactions were obtained between family size and the sex, age, or religion of the respondents.

Interpersonal Perceptions. The mean interpersonal perception scores for each family size are contained in Table 8. The responses to these items were scored so that values greater than 4.00 indicate perceptions of socially desirable characteristics, while values less than 4.00 indicate perceptions of socially undesirable characteristics. The mean scores for all 15 scales are greater than 4.00 indicating that the families were perceived favorably at all levels of family size. Nevertheless, there were significant differences in how the different sized families were

TABLE 8

MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR FAMILIES WITH 0, 2, 4, AND 6 CHILDREN

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	0	2	4	6
INTELLIGENCE	4.95 (835)[a]	5.05 (828)	4.56 (831)	4.10 (825)
MATURITY	5.08 (833)	5.26 (829)	4.82 (827)	4.54 (819)
PATIENCE	5.01 (824)	4.95 (823)	4.69 (822)	4.54 (815)
UNSELFISHNESS	4.18 (828)	4.80 (820)	4.61 (822)	4.47 (818)
WARMTH	4.32 (824)	4.97 (821)	5.05 (819)	5.08 (8.7)
PLEASANTNESS	4.62 (825)	5.00 (820)	4.95 (822)	4.94 (811)
SATISFACTION	4.77 (834)	4.94 (826)	4.84 (825)	4.80 (813)
LUCK	4.07 (828)	4.73 (826)	4.64 (822)	4.33 (817)
HAPPINESS	4.60 (826)	5.03 (823)	4.98 (826)	4.93 (820)
PRIDE	4.68 (826)	5.23 (824)	5.24 (824)	5.19 (817)
RELIABILITY	5.01 (824)	5.19 (821)	4.97 (823)	4.80 (816)
HARDWORK	4.97 (829)	5.30 (826)	5.27 (822)	5.28 (816)
CONSIDERATION	4.70 (827)	4.94 (817)	4.62 (823)	4.33 (818)
THOUGHTFULNESS	4.68 (829)	4.95 (822)	4.56 (824)	4.29 (822)
SECURITY	4.81 (830)	4.89 (825)	4.70 (827)	4.49 (819)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

viewed. Analyses of variance showed that there were significant differences between the means for all items except satisfaction. In general, families with two children were described most favorably. Families with two children were perceived to be significantly more mature, unselfish, lucky, reliable, considerate, and thoughtful than those of any other size. Along with families having four and six children, the families with two children were seen as warmer, more pleasant, happier, prouder, and more hardworking than families with no children. They were seen as more patient and intelligent than families with four or six children, and more secure than families with six children.

Although they were not described quite as favorably as families with just two children, families with four children were also perceived favorably. Compared to families with six children, families with four children were described as more mature, patient, lucky, reliable, considerate, thoughtful, and secure. Compared to families with no children, they are both more unselfish and lucky.

While families with six children were perceived to be relatively warm, pleasant, happy, and proud, they were also described as significantly less intelligent, less mature, less patient, less reliable, less considerate, less thoughtful, and less secure than any other size family.

Families with no children were described as more patient than families of any other size. Along with families having two children, they were seen as more intelligent than families with four or six children, and along with families having two or four children, they were seen as more secure than families with six children. On the other hand, families

with no children were described as significantly less warm, less pleasant, less lucky, less happy, less proud, less hardworking, and less unselfish than families of any other size.

These data show that the number of children in a family does have an effect on how that family is perceived by others. In general, families with either two or four children were viewed most favorably. While families with six children were seen as warm and happy, they were also viewed as less mature and thoughtful than others. Families with no children were seen as particularly mature and patient; they were also viewed as less happy and as having less pride than families with children.

ADDITIONAL CHILD

Moral Judgment. The mean moral judgment scores for the stories concerned with the decision to have an additional child are contained in Table 9. All families described in these stories were blamed for having an additional child except the two high income families with one child, and the high income family with two male children. Families earning $6,000 received more blame than those earning $16,000 regardless of the number and sex of their children.

The analysis of variance yielded significant main effects for number of children ($F = 11.22$, $df = 3/1118$, $p < .001$) and income ($F = 179.64$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$). Families with one child received less blame ($\bar{X} = 3.81$) than those with two children ($\bar{X} = 3.46$), three children ($\bar{X} = 3.17$), or four children ($\bar{X} = 3.21$). The Newman-Keuls

test showed that the mean moral judgment scores for families with one, two, and three children differed significantly from each other. The mean moral judgment score received by families with four children was significantly lower than only the mean scores received by families with one child and those with two children. Thus, the amount of blame ascribed to families having an additional child increased as the number of children in these families increased from one to three, but it did not increase any further as the number of children in these families increased to four.

TABLE 9

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, SEX OF CHILDREN, AND INCOME

INCOME	SEX OF CHILDREN	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
		1	2	3	4
$ 6,000	Male	3.10 (71)[a]	2.51 (67)	2.88 (73)	2.89 (74)
	Female	3.00 (74)	2.96 (67)	2.47 (68)	2.86 (70)
$16,000	Male	4.44 (64)	4.43 (72)	3.55 (67)	3.54 (69)
	Female	4.69 (70)	3.92 (78)	3.78 (77)	3.56 (73)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

The mean moral judgment score for families earning $6,000 was 2.84 compared to an average score of 3.98 for families earning $16,000. Thus, families with high incomes received significantly less blame for having an additional child than families with low incomes.

The analysis of variance also resulted in a significant first order interaction between the number of children and income ($F = 5.33$, $df = 3/1118$, $p < .001$) and a significant second order interaction between number of children, sex of children, and income ($F = 4.08$, $df = 3/1118$, $p < .01$). A Newman-Keuls test showed that income, but not sex of child, affects the moral judgments of families with either one child or two children. High income families with one or two children received significantly higher moral judgment scores than low income families with the same number of children regardless of the sex of their children. Income was found to affect the moral judgments of families with three daughters, but it did not affect the judgments of families with three sons. The high income families with three daughters and desiring a son received significantly less blame for their decision to have another child than was received by low income families with three daughters and also desiring a son. Neither the sex of the children nor the income of the family affected the moral judgments received by families with four children.

To determine the effects of the sex, age, and religion of the respondent on moral judgments of families for having an additional child, an analysis of variance was conducted with these as factors along with two of the factors contained in the stories -- number of children and income. Significant main effects were obtained for age ($F = 12.57$, $df = 2/912$, $p < .001$) and religion ($F = 8.28$, $df = 1/912$, $p < .01$). Respondents who were 16-17 years of age ascribed significantly less blame to families having an additional child ($\bar{X} = 3.69$) than

respondents who were 18-19 years of age ($\bar{X}$ = 3.26) or those who were 20 years of age and older ($\bar{X}$ = 3.20). Respondents who were Catholic ascribed significantly less blame to these families ($\bar{X}$ = 3.58) than respondents who were Protestant ($\bar{X}$ = 3.26).

Significant interactions were obtained between number of children and sex of respondent (F = 3.80, df = 3/912, p <.01) and between number of children and age of respondent (F = 2.31, df = 6/923, p <.05). The mean moral judgment scores for families having an additional child are presented in Table 10 for families of different sizes by age and sex of respondent. Families of all sizes were blamed by respondents who were 18-19 years of age and by those who were 20 years of age or older. Families with two, three, and four children were also blamed by respondents who were 16-17 years of age, but the family with one child was not blamed by respondents in this age group. The Newman-Keuls test showed, however, that there were no significant differences between the mean moral judgments ascribed to the families with different numbers of children by respondents who were 16-17 years of age. Respondents who were 18-19 years of age blamed families with three children significantly more than they blamed those with just one child. Respondents who were 20 years of age or older blamed families with four children significantly more than they blamed those with only one or two children. Thus, 17-18 year old respondents appeared to be most critical of families with three children, while the older group of respondents was more critical of families with four children. The Newman-Keuls test also showed that age of respondent did not affect the moral judgments of families with fewer

than four children. Families with four children, however, are blamed significantly more by respondents who are 20 years of age or older than by those who are 16-17 or 18-19 years of age.

TABLE 10

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, AGE OF RESPONDENT AND SEX OF RESPONDENT

AGE AND SEX OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	1	2	3	4
AGE OF RESPONDENT				
16-17	4.09 (121)[a]	3.60 (120)	3.48 (118)	3.57 (123)
18-19	3.59 (69)	3.33 (63)	2.88 (72)	3.25 (63)
20+	3.48 (58)	3.69 (58)	3.05 (62)	2.66 (68)
SEX OF RESPONDENT				
Male	3.67 (127)	3.56 (130)	3.00 (132)	3.44 (131)
Female	3.96 (121)	3.56 (124)	3.43 (120)	3.05 (123)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

The data in Table 10 pertaining to moral judgments made by male and female respondents indicate that the respondents of both sexes blamed families for having an additional child. A Newman-Keuls test showed that there were no significant differences in the judgments made by male and female respondents for families with one, two, three, or four children. However, there were differences in their pattern of judgments for families with three or four children. Although these differences

were not statistically significant, male respondents blamed families with three children for having another child more than female respondents blamed them. However, female respondents blamed families with four children for having another child more than male respondents blamed them.

Partly as a result of these differences, the results of the Newman-Keuls test differed somewhat for male and female respondents. A significant difference was obtained for male respondents between their judgments of families with one child and their judgments of families with three children, but not between their judgments of families with one child and those with four children. Female respondents, however, gave significantly more blame to families with either three or four children than to families with just one child. They also attributed more blame to families with four children than to families with one child.

These results indicate that male and female respondents differed in their judgments of the larger families in relation to their judgments of smaller families. Male respondents appeared especially critical of families with three children, while female respondents appeared critical of families having either three or four children.

Table 11 contains the mean moral judgment scores for families with one to four children presented by the number of siblings the respondents had, the number of children they wanted, and the number of children they expected. The data are not presented by number of children actually had by married respondents since many of the sample sizes were too small.

While families with two, three, and four children were blamed by all groups of respondents with different numbers of siblings, families having

TABLE 11

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

CHARACTERISTIC OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	1	2	3	4
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS				
0	4.25 (12)[a]	3.29 (14)	2.94 (18)	2.15 (13)
1-2	3.75 (99)	3.37 (103)	3.22 (86)	3.06 (108)
3-4	3.53 (95)	3.72 (83)	3.00 (98)	3.40 (92)
5+	4.07 (72)	3.49 (80)	3.30 (78)	3.33 (69)
NUMBER OF CHILDREN WANTED				
0	3.71 (17)	2.54 (11)	2.47 (17)	2.59 (17)
1-2	3.53 (140)	3.13 (125)	2.67 (141)	2.98 (143)
3-4	4.01 (74)	4.00 (82)	3.59 (66)	3.47 (75)
5+	4.43 (30)	4.30 (27)	4.31 (29)	4.00 (18)
NUMBER OF CHILDREN EXPECTED				
0	3.40 (20)	2.47 (15)	2.31 (16)	2.47 (15)
1-2	3.61 (142)	3.20 (112)	2.84 (131)	2.90 (136)
3-4	4.03 (66)	3.77 (78)	3.39 (59)	3.60 (70)
5+	4.46 (24)	4.45 (22)	4.08 (25)	4.06 (18)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

only one child were blamed only by respondents with 1-2 siblings or 3-4 siblings. Respondents with no siblings and those with 1-2 siblings ascribed increasing amounts of blame as the number of children in the families increased. While respondents with 3-4 siblings and those with 5 and more siblings also seemed to ascribe more blame to larger families, those respondents with at least three siblings in their own families appeared to blame families with four children no more than they blamed those with three children.

The analysis of variance of the data for respondents having different numbers of siblings yielded a significant main effect for number of siblings ($F = 4.87$, $df = 3/1104$, $p < .01$). This suggests that respondents with different numbers of siblings tend to ascribe different amounts of blame to families for having an additional child. Those with no siblings were most critical ($\bar{X} = 3.12$), while those with five or more siblings were least critical ($\bar{X} = 3.54$). The amount of blame ascribed by respondents with 1-2 siblings ($\bar{X} = 3.35$) was similar to the amount ascribed by respondents with 3-4 siblings ($\bar{X} = 3.40$). Despite the fact that the analysis of variance resulted in a significant main effect for number of siblings, the Newman-Keuls test indicated that none of the differences between these four means was statistically significant. This failure to find a significant difference between the means was probably due to the difference in the number of respondents in the four groups. While the group with no siblings contained only 57 respondents, the other groups contained from 299 to 396 respondents. Since the analysis of variance is robust with respect to differences in sample

size, it can be assumed that significant differences did exist among the means regardless of the outcome of the Newman-Keuls test. Furthermore it appears from an examination of the data that respondents with no siblings were significantly more critical of families for having an additional child than the respondents with five or more siblings. The respondents with no siblings may also have been more critical of these families than respondents with 1-2 or 3-4 siblings.

In addition to the main effect for number of siblings, a significant interaction was obtained between the number of children in the families expecting an additional child and number of siblings ($F = 15.38$, $df = 9/1104$, $p < .001$). The Newman-Keuls test showed that the number of siblings did not affect the moral judgments of families with one, two, or three children. Families with four children, however, were blamed significantly more by respondents with no siblings than by those with 3-4 siblings or by those with at least five siblings. The Newman-Keuls test also showed that there were no significant differences in the judgments of families with different numbers of children made by respondents with 1-2 siblings, 3-4 siblings, and 5 or more siblings. However, those with no siblings blamed families with three and four children more than they blamed those with only one child. These respondents also blamed families with four children more than they blamed those with two children.

Respondents wanting either no children or 1-2 children blamed families of all sizes for their decision to have an additional child. Respondents wanting 3-4 children blamed only those families with three

and four children, while respondents wanting at least five children did not blame any of the families regardless of the number of children they contained. The moral judgment scores for families with two, three, and four children increased with increases in the number of children wanted by the respondents themselves. The moral judgment scores for families with no children also increased as the number of children wanted by the respondents increased beyond 1-2 children.

The analysis of the data from respondents wanting different numbers of children resulted in a significant main effect for number of children wanted ($F = 29.89$, $df = 3/996$, $p < .001$). While respondents who wanted five or more children praised families for their decision to have another child ($\bar{X} = 4.29$), those wanting fewer numbers of children tended to blame these families. The respondents who wanted no children of their own ascribed the most blame ($\bar{X} = 2.85$). Those wanting 1-2 children ascribed more blame ($\bar{X} = 3.07$) than those wanting 3-4 children ($\bar{X} = 3.78$). The Newman-Keuls test showed that the mean moral judgment score received from respondents wanting at least five children was significantly larger than the scores received from respondents wanting no children, 1-2 children, or 3-4 children. The Newman-Keuls test also showed that the mean score obtained from respondents wanting 3-4 children was significantly larger than those obtained from respondents wanting no children or 1-2 children. Thus, respondents who wanted large families of their own tended more to praise families for having an additional child, while families wanting few children or no children tended more to blame these families.

The interaction between the number of children in the families expecting an additional child and the number of children wanted by the respondents was not statistically significant ($F = 0.52$, $df = 9/996$, $p > .05$).

The moral judgments for families with one to four children increase with increases in the number of children expected by the respondents. An analysis of variance resulted in a significant main effect for number of children expected ($F = 22.62$, $df = 3/933$, $p < .001$). The most favorable judgments were made by respondents expecting to have five or more children ($\bar{X} = 4.27$), while the least favorable judgments were made by those expecting to have no children at all ($\bar{X} = 2.71$). Respondents wanting 1-2 children responded less favorably ($\bar{X} = 3.14$) than those wanting 3-4 children ($\bar{X} = 3.71$). The Newman-Keuls test showed that the differences between all pairs of means were statistically significant. Thus, families that have decided to have an additional child are praised by respondents expecting to have large families themselves, but they are blamed by those expecting few children or no children at all.

The interaction between the number of children in the families expecting an additional child and the number of children expected by the respondents was not statistically significant ($F = 0.83$, $df = 9/933$, $p > .05$).

Social Pressure. The mean social pressure scores for the stories concerned with the decision to have an additional child are contained in Table 12. The scores indicate that the respondents would have attempted to influence all families earning $6,000 not to have additional

children. While the respondents also stated that they would have attempted to influence families earning $16,000 to have no more children if they already had three or four children in their families, they would not have attempted to influence in this manner those with only one or two children.

TABLE 12

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN, SEX OF CHILDREN, AND INCOME

INCOME	SEX OF CHILDREN	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
		1	2	3	4
$ 6,000	Male	4.65 (71)[a]	5.16 (67)	4.88 (73)	5.03 (74)
	Female	4.88 (74)	4.75 (67)	5.26 (68)	4.94 (70)
$16,000	Male	3.69 (64)	3.76 (72)	4.49 (67)	4.45 (69)
	Female	3.50 (70)	3.97 (78)	4.16 (77)	4.53 (73)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

An analysis of variance resulted in significant main effects for the number of children in the families being judged (F = 11.61, df = 3/1118, p <.001) and income (F = 131.74, df =1/1118, p <.001). Although the respondents would have attempted to influence all families to have no more children, the strongest influence attempts would be made for families with three children ($\bar{X}$ = 4.70) and four children ($\bar{X}$ = 4.74). The weakest attempts would be made for families with two children ($\bar{X}$ = 4.41) and one

child ($\bar{X}$ = 4.18). The Newman-Keuls test showed that the differences between all pairs of means were significantly different except for the difference between the means for families with three children and those with four children. Thus, as the number of children in the family increases to three, increasingly strong attempts would be made to persuade these families to have no more children. Beyond that number of children, however, the amount of social pressure appears not to increase further.

The analysis of variance also resulted in a significant first order interaction between number of children and income (F = 4.27, df = 3/1118, p <.01) and a significant second order interaction between number of children, sex of children, and income (F = 3.96, df = 3/1118, p <.01). The Newman-Keuls test showed that income, but not sex of children, affects the social pressure that would be applied to families with one or two children. High income families with one child would receive pressure to have another child, while low income families with one child would receive pressure not to have another child. High income families with two children would receive just very slight pressure, if any, to have another child, while low income families with two children would receive pressure not to have another child. Among families with three children, social pressure would be affected by income, but only if the children were all girls and the families desired a boy. Among families with three daughters, significantly stronger attempts would be made to influence those earning just $6,000 not to have any more children than those earning $16,000. Neither income nor sex of children was found to affect the judgments of families with four children. These data

indicate that families earning $6,000 would receive social pressures to have no more children regardless of the number of children they already have. While the low income family with three daughters would receive significantly stronger influence attempts than any other family, no other significant differences were obtained between the mean social pressure scores for the various families earning $6,000. The direction and magnitude of the social pressure that would be received by high income families, on the other hand, would depend on the number of children in their families. Those with only one child tended to receive significantly lower social pressure scores than those with three or four children.

While there appears to be more tolerance of high income families than low income families for having an additional child, this greater amount of tolerance appears only for families that have few children initially. This difference in tolerance begins to disappear for families with three children and no longer exists for families with four children.

To determine the effects of respondent sex, age, and religion on social pressure, an analysis of variance was conducted with these as factors along with number of children and income. No significant main effects were obtained for sex, age, or religion. In addition, none of the interactions between these factors and number of children was significant, indicating that the sex, age, and religion of the respondent have no effects of social pressure.

Interpersonal Perceptions. The mean interpersonal perception scores for families expecting an additional child are presented in Table 13 by the number of children in the families. Analyses of variance were

conducted for each scale, and significant differences between the means were obtained on nine of the 15 scales. Families having only one child were most consistantly described favorably. Compared to families with three or four children, families with one child were described as significantly more intelligent, mature, patient, happy, and thoughtful. They were described as being significantly more unselfish, lucky, and considerate than families with three children, and less dissatisfied than any other size family. While families with two children also received consistantly favorable descriptions, they were not described quite as favorably as those with one child. Families with two children were perceived as significantly more unselfish than those with three or four children as well as more patient and thoughtful than those with three children. Families with three children were described unfavorably on seven of the 15 scales, while those with four children were described unfavorably on six of the scales. Compared to families with one child, those with three or four children were described as significantly less intelligent, less mature, less patient, less satisfied, less happy, and less thoughtful. They were also seen as more selfish than families with two children. Compared to families with just one child, families with three children are seen as more selfish and inconsiderate, and less lucky. Finally, compared to families with two children, those with three children are perceived to be more impatient and unthoughtful.

While famililies with three or four children were described as warm and pleasant, they were also seen as relatively unthoughtful and selfish. They were described also as relatively unintelligent and impatient. Thus, large families who decide to have an additional child are perceived to be friendly, but comparatively self-centered and more concerned about themselves than about others.

TABLE 13

MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR FAMILIES EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL CHILD BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
	1	2	3	4
INTELLIGENCE	4.27 (274)[a]	4.01 (279)	3.76 (279)	3.69 (279)
MATURITY	4.38 (276)	4.15 (279)	3.81 (278)	3.84 (284)
PATIENCE	4.26 (271)	4.14 (276)	3.66 (277)	3.86 (276)
UNSELFISHNESS	4.10 (272)	4.18 (278)	3.65 (275)	3.78 (276)
WARMTH	4.88 (267)	4.94 (278)	4.73 (277)	4.92 (275)
PLEASANTNESS	4.75 (269)	4.80 (279)	4.64 (276)	4.68 (276)
SATISFACTION	3.99 (273)	3.62 (277)	3.36 (278)	3.47 (277)
LUCK	4.49 (272)	4.23 (277)	4.02 (275)	4.24 (275)
HAPPINESS	4.69 (271)	4.57 (279)	4.32 (276)	4.25 (278)
PRIDE	4.94 (271)	4.77 (276)	4.66 (276)	4.73 (273)
RELIABILITY	4.54 (272)	4.63 (277)	4.40 (277)	4.56 (275)
HARDWORKING	4.96 (272)	4.94 (277)	4.76 (272)	4.87 (276)
CONSIDERATION	4.36 (272)	4.16 (277)	3.89 (274)	4.04 (276)
THOUGHTFULNESS	4.23 (272)	4.09 (278)	3.64 (276)	3.81 (277)
SECURITY	4.30 (276)	4.22 (280)	4.00 (277)	4.25 (279)

[a] Number in parentheses indicate sample size.

FEMALE MARITAL STATUS

Moral Judgment. The mean moral judgment scores for the stories concerning a married or unmarried female are presented in Table 14. The average moral judgment scores ranged in value from 2.96 to 5.46. An analysis of variance resulted in a significant main effect for marital status (F = 17.24, df = 1/1118, p <.001). While married women tended to be praised slightly for getting married ($\bar{X}$ = 4.22), those who were single tended to be blamed slightly for remaining single ($\bar{X}$ = 3.87).

TABLE 14

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY ATTRACTIVENESS, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE

ATTRACTIVENESS	MARITAL INTENT	PARENTAL PRESSURE	MARITAL STATUS	
			MARRIED	SINGLE
ATTRACTIVE	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	4.42 (67)[a]	4.14 (73)
		TO STAY SINGLE	5.46 (70)	2.96 (71)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	3.21 (75)	4.49 (74)
		TO STAY SINGLE	4.20 (71)	3.88 (77)
UNATTRACTIVE	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	4.27 (62)	3.90 (74)
		TO STAY SINGLE	5.19 (70)	3.62 (69)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	3.10 (69)	4.33 (67)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.84 (73)	3.62 (72)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

The analysis of variance also resulted in significant interactions between marital status and marital intent ($F = 111.64$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$) and between marital status and parental pressure ($F = 102.96$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$). The mean moral judgment scores for married and single women are presented in Table 15 by marital intent and parental pressure. While married women who intended to get married were praised for getting married, those who had intended to stay single were blamed for getting married. Single women who intended to get married were blamed for staying single, while those who intended to stay single were slightly praised. The Newman-Keuls test showed that each of these differences was statistically significant. Thus, there was a tendency among the respondents to praise women whose actions regarding marriage were consistent with their intentions, and to blame women whose actions were inconsistent with their intentions. At the same time, the respondents gave significantly more praise to married women whose behavior was consistent than to single women whose behavior was consistent. They did not, however, give significantly more blame to either single or married women whose behavior was inconsistent.

The data in Table 15 pertaining to parental pressure show that married women whose parents attempted to influence them to stay single were praised for getting married, while those whose parents attempted to influence them to get married were blamed for getting married. Single women whose parents attempted to influence them to stay single were blamed for remaining single, while those whose parents attempted to influence them to get married were praised for remaining single. The

Newman-Keuls test showed that both differences were statistically significant. Thus, women whose actions regarding marriage conformed to parental pressures were blamed, while those whose actions did not conform to parental pressures were praised. Among women not conforming to parental pressure, however, those who were married were praised significantly more than those who remained single. Among those who conformed, women who were married received less blame than women who were single.

TABLE 15

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY MARITAL INTENT AND PARENTAL PRESSURE

MARITAL INTENT AND PARENTAL PRESSURE	MARITAL STATUS	
	MARRIED	SINGLE
MARITAL INTENT		
To Get Married	4.84 (269)[a]	3.66 (287)
To Stay Single	3.59 (288)	4.08 (290)
PARENTAL PRESSURE		
To Get Married	3.75 (273)	4.22 (288)
To Stay Single	4.67 (284)	3.52 (289)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

To determine the effects of respondent sex, age, and religion on moral judgments of marital status, an analysis of variance was conducted with these factors along with marital status, marital intent, and parental pressure. None of the interactions involving marital status and any of the three respondent characteristics was statistically significant, indicating that moral judgments of marital status are not affected by the sex, age, or religion of the respondents.

Social Pressure. The mean social pressure scores for each of the stories concerning a married or unmarried female are presented in Table 16. Scores increasingly greater than 4.00 indicate increasing amounts of social pressure to remain single, while scores increasingly smaller than 4.00 indicate increasing amounts of social pressure to get married. The data in Table 16 show that attempts would have been made to influence the single women in all stories to get married. While the respondents also indicated that they would have attempted to similarly influence married women who wanted to get married, they would have attempted to influence those who did not want to get married to actually remain single unless their parents were also attempting to influence these women to remain single. When the parents of these married women wanted their daughters to stay single, the respondents would have attempted to influence them to get married.

TABLE 16

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY ATTRACTIVENESS, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE

ATTRACTIVENESS	MARITAL INTENT	PARENTAL PRESSURE	MARITAL STATUS	
			MARRIED	SINGLE
ATTRACTIVE	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	3.92 (67)[a]	3.45 (73)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.23 (70)	3.10 (71)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	4.31 (75)	3.96 (74)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.82 (71)	3.46 (77)
UNATTRACTIVE	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	3.58 (62)	3.45 (74)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.36 (70)	3.36 (69)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	4.39 (69)	3.81 (67)
		TO STAY SINGLE	4.10 (73)	[illegible]2)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

An analysis of variance of these data resulted in a significant main effect for marital status ($F = 32.30$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$). The mean social pressure score for married women was 3.49 compared to an average score of 3.84 for single women. While these scores indicate that attempts would have been made to influence both single and married women toward marriage, stronger attempts would have been made to influence women who subsequently did get married.

A significant first order interaction was obtained between marital status and marital intent ($F = 6.84$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .01$), while a significant second order interaction was obtained between marital status marital intent, and attractiveness ($F = 5.07$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .05$). Table 17 contains the mean social pressure scores received by married and single women presented by marital intent and attractiveness. The results of a Newman-Keuls test indicated that marital intent affects the social pressure scores received by single women, but only when the women are attractive. While attempts would have been made to influence single women toward marriage whether or not they actually wanted to get married, there would have been stronger attempts to influence attractive women who wanted to get married than attractive women who wanted to stay single. On the other hand, the attempts to influence unattractive women who wanted to get married would have been no stronger than the attempts to influence unattractive women who wanted to stay single. The Newman-Keuls test also showed that marital intent affects the social pressure scores received by married women, but it affects the scores received by both attractive and unattractive women. The social pressures scores

received by both attractive and unattractive women who want to stay single are significantly greater than those who want to get married. Moreover, the magnitude of the scores indicate that married women who wanted to stay single would have received social pressures encouraging them to remain single, while those who wanted to get married would have received social pressures encouraging them to get married. Thus, attempts would have been made to influence married women to act in accordance with their intentions regardless of their attractiveness.

TABLE 17

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES BY MARITAL INTENT AND ATTRACTIVENESS

MARITAL INTENT	ATTRACTIVENESS	MARITAL STATUS	
		MARRIED	SINGLE
TO GET MARRIED	ATTRACTIVE	3.58 (137)[a]	3.28 (144)
	UNATTRACTIVE	3.47 (132)	3.40 (137)
TO STAY SINGLE	ATTRACTIVE	4.06 (146)	3.71 (151)
	UNATTRACTIVE	4.24 (142)	3.56 (139)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

The effects of respondent sex, age, and religion on social pressure scores was examined in an analysis of variance with these factors along with marital status, marital intent, and parental pressure. The only significant interaction that was obtained involving marital status was a

third order interaction between marital status, marital intent, parental pressure and religion ($F = 5.92$, $df = 1/912$, $p < .05$). Table 18 contains the mean social pressure scores received by married and single females by marital intent, parental pressure, and religion of respondent. An attempt to decipher the meaning of this interaction failed to reveal meaningful differences in the response patterns of Catholic and Protestant respondents.

TABLE 18

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND UNMARRIED FEMALES BY MARITAL INTENT, PARENTAL PRESSURE, AND RELIGION OF RESPONDENT

MARITAL INTENT	PARENTAL PRESSURE	RELIGION OF RESPONDENT	MARITAL STATUS	
			MARRIED	SINGLE
TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	PROTESTANT	3.87 (45)[a]	3.30 (50)
		CATHOLIC	3.67 (70)	3.49 (80)
	TO STAY SINGLE	PROTESTANT	3.25 (51)	3.22 (51)
		CATHOLIC	3.40 (73)	3.19 (73)
TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	PROTESTANT	4.28 (46)	4.00 (48)
		CATHOLIC	4.43 (79)	3.84 (79)
	TO STAY SINGLE	PROTESTANT	4.25 (52)	3.40 (52)
		CATHOLIC	3.74 (78)	3.27 (81)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

Interpersonal Perception. The mean interpersonal perception scores for married and single females are contained in Table 19. Married women were perceived favorably on all scales except satisfaction and security, while single women were judged favorably on all scales except satisfaction, luck, happiness, pride, and security. Single women, moreover, were perceived as being especially patient.

The significance of the difference between the scores for married and unmarried women on each trait was determined by *t*-tests. Significant differences were obtained on seven of the fifteen scales. Married women were perceived as significantly more lucky, happy, and proud than single women. Single women, on the other hand, were perceived as being more patient, intelligent, reliable, and thoughtful. Thus, while single women are judged to be unhappy, unlucky, and dissatisfied, they were seen as having many positive qualities, such as patience, thoughtfulness, and consideration. They were seen also as being intelligent and mature, although lacking in security.

MALE MARITAL STATUS

Moral Judgment. The mean moral judgment scores for the stories describing a married or unmarried male are presented in Table 20. The men receiving the highest scores were those with high stability who were married and who had intended to get married. An analysis of variance failed to result in a significant main effect for marital status (F = 2.60, df = 1/1118, p >.05), although significant interactions were

TABLE 19

MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE FEMALES

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORE	MARITAL STATUS	
	MARRIED	SINGLE
INTELLIGENCE	4.51 (542)[a]	4.72* (562)
MATURITY	4.39 (548)	4.48 (564)
PATIENCE	4.40 (542)	5.06* (561)
UNSELFISHNESS	4.48 (540)	4.52 (554)
WARMTH	4.54 (539)	4.42 (557)
PLEASANTNESS	4.71 (539)	4.60 (555)
SATISFACTION	3.90 (544)	3.79 (558)
LUCK	4.10 (542)	3.57* (555)
HAPPINESS	4.06 (546)	3.74* (559)
PRIDE	4.33 (542)	3.97* (554)
RELIABILITY	4.59 (542)	4.82* (554)
HARDWORKING	4.62 (542)	4.63 (554)
CONSIDERATION	4.58 (539)	4.70 (555)
THOUGHTFULNESS	4.47 (542)	4.68* (556)
SECURITY	3.77 (546)	3.65 (559)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

* t-test, $p<.05$.

TABLE 20

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY STABILITY, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE

STABILITY	MARITAL INTENT	PARENTAL PRESSURE	MARITAL STATUS	
			MARRIED	SINGLE
HIGH	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	5.14 (72)[a]	4.00 (77)
		TO STAY SINGLE	5.09 (67)	3.50 (70)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	4.15 (74)	4.52 (64)
		TO STAY SINGLE	4.05 (65)	3.96 (67)
LOW	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	3.57 (68)	3.75 (72)
		TO STAY SINGLE	4.12 (83)	3.22 (71)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	3.12 (74)	4.53 (73)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.00 (64)	3.82 (73)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

obtained between marital status and stability ($F = 37.53$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$), marital status and marital intent ($F = 88.97$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$), and marital status and parental pressure ($F = 16.59$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .001$).

The mean moral judgment scores for married and single men are presented in Table 21 by stability, marital intent, and parental pressure. The data in the table pertaining to stability indicate that married men who were stable were praised for getting married, while those who were unstable were blamed for getting married. Single men who were stable were neither praised nor blamed for remaining single, although those who were unstable were blamed slightly for remaining single. The Newman-Keuls test showed that the difference in scores among married men was statistically significant, while the difference in scores among unmarried men was not. Thus, stability has an effect on the judgments of married men, but not on the judgments of single men. The Newman-Keuls test also showed that stable men are praised significantly more if they are married rather than single, but that unstable men are blamed significantly more if they are married rather than single.

The data in Table 21 pertaining to marital intent indicate that married men who intended to get married were praised for getting married, while those who intended to remain single were blamed for getting married. On the other hand, single men who intended to get married were blamed for staying single, while those who intended to remain single were praised for staying single. These results suggest

TABLE 21

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY STABILITY; BY MARITAL INTENT; AND BY PARENTAL PRESSURE

STABILITY, MARITAL INTENT AND PARENTAL PRESSURE	MARITAL STATUS	
	MARRIED	SINGLE
STABILITY		
High	4.61 (278)[a]	4.00 (278)
Low	3.45 (289)	3.83 (289)
MARITAL INTENT		
To Get Married	4.48 (290)	3.62 (290)
To Stay Single	3.58 (277)	4.21 (277)
PARENTAL PRESSURE		
To Get Married	4.00 (288)	4.20 (286)
To Stay Single	4.06 (279)	3.62 (281)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

that men are praised when their actions regarding marriage are consistent with their intentions, but that they blamed when their actions conflict with their intentions. Similar results were obtained in the portion of the study dealing with female marital status. Among the men whose behavior was consistent with their intentions, those who were married received significantly more praise than those who were single. Among those whose behavior was not consistent with their intentions, there was no significant difference in the amount of blame received by single or married men. These findings are also identical to those obtained from the portion of the study dealing with female marital status.

The data in Table 21 pertaining to parental pressure indicate that married men whose parents wanted them to get married were neither praised nor blamed for getting married, while those whose parents tried to influence them to remain single were praised very slightly for getting married. Single men whose parents attempted to influence them to get married were praised slightly for remaining single, while those whose parents attempted to influence them to remain single were blamed for staying single. The Newman-Keuls test showed that these differences in moral judgment were significantly different for single men, but not for married men. Thus, both single men and single women are praised for not conforming to parental pressure and blamed for conforming. While married women are also blamed for conforming and praised for not conforming, married men who conform are neither praised nor blamed, and those not conforming receive only a bare amount of praise.

To determine the effects of sex, age, and religion on moral judgments of married and single men, an analysis of variance was conducted with

these as factors along with marital status, stability, and marital intent. A significant first order interaction was obtained between marital status and age ($F = 3.38$, $df = 2/912$, $p < .05$). The mean moral judgment scores for married and single men are presented by age of respondent in Table 22. While single men received increasing amounts of blame as the respondents became younger, married men received increasing amounts of praise as the respondents became younger. The Newman-Keuls test, however, failed to indicate any significant differences between the means, probably as a result of discrepancies in sample size. Examination of the data in Table 22, however, suggests that moral judgments of married and single men made by 16-17 year old respondents were significantly different, while those made by 18-19 year old respondents and those made by respondents who were at least 20 years of age did not differ significantly.

TABLE 22

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

AGE OF RESPONDENT	MARITAL STATUS	
	MARRIED	SINGLE
16-17	4.15 (254)[a]	3.77 (241)
18-19	4.03 (124)	3.92 (143)
20+	3.90 (125)	3.97 (121)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

The analysis of variance involving respondent sex, age, and religion also resulted in a significant second order interaction between marital status, marital intent, and sex of respondent ($F = 5.58$, $df = 1/912$, $p < .05$). The mean moral judgment scores for married and single men are presented by age of respondent in Table 23 by marital intent and sex of respondent. The Newman-Keuls test indicated the moral judgment scores from both male and female respondents were significantly higher for married men who wanted to get married than for married men who wanted to stay single. Similarly, the moral judgment scores from both male and female respondents were significantly higher for single men who wanted to remain single than for single men who wanted to get married. To interpret the significant interaction, it is useful to consider the data in terms of consistency between behavior and intentions. Discrepant behavior on the part of both married and single men was judged blameworthy by both male and female respondents. Moreover, there were no significant differences in the amount of blame ascribed by either male or female respondents to married or single men for their discrepant behavior. While behavior consistent with intentions was judged praiseworthy by both male and female respondents, consistent behavior of single men was judged less praiseworthy by male respondents than consistent behavior of married men was judged by either male or female respondents. However, the moral judgment of consistent behavior of single men made by female respondents did not differ significantly from the judgments of consistent behavior of married men made by either male or female respondents.

TABLE 23

MEAN MORAL JUDGMENT SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MEN BY MARITAL INTENT AND SEX OF RESPONDENT

MARITAL INTENT	SEX OF RESPONDENT	MARITAL STATUS	
		MARRIED	SINGLE
TO GET MARRIED	MALE	4.46 (132)[a]	3.66 (129)
	FEMALE	4.53 (124)	3.41 (126)
TO STAY SINGLE	MALE	3.73 (128)	4.07 (131)
	FEMALE	3.47 (119)	4.32 (119)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

Social Pressure. The mean social pressure score for each story concerned with the marital status of a male is contained in Table 24. The analysis of variance yielded a significant main effect for marital status ($F = 9.44$, $df = 1/1118$, $p < .01$). The mean social pressure score received by married men was 3.79, while the mean score received by single men was 4.00. Thus, the respondents indicated that they would have attempted to influence married men to get married, but that they would not have attempted to influence single men to either remain single or to get married. None of the interactions involving marital status was statistically significant.

The effects of respondent sex, age, and religion on social pressure scores was examined in an analysis of variance with these as factors along with marital status, stability, and marital intent. The only significant interaction that was obtained involving marital status was

TABLE 24

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND UNMARRIED MEN BY STABILITY, MARITAL INTENT, AND PARENTAL PRESSURE

STABILITY	MARITAL INTENT	PARENTAL PRESSURE	MARITAL STATUS	
			MARRIED	SINGLE
HIGH	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	3.38 (72)[a]	3.23 (77)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.54 (67)	3.29 (70)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	3.99 (74)	3.97 (64)
		TO STAY SINGLE	4.20 (65)	3.66 (67)
LOW	TO GET MARRIED	TO GET MARRIED	4.09 (68)	3.93 (72)
		TO STAY SINGLE	3.89 (83)	3.80 (71)
	TO STAY SINGLE	TO GET MARRIED	4.47 (74)	4.33 (73)
		TO STAY SINGLE	4.45 (64)	4.11 (73)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

a second order interaction between marital status, marital intent, and religion of respondent ($F = 5.36$, df 1/912, $p < .05$). The mean social pressure scores received by married and single men are presented in Table 25 by marital intent and religion of respondent. The Newman-Keuls test indicated that there was a significant difference in the social pressures scores from Protestant and Catholic respondents for married men who wanted to get married. Catholic respondents indicated that they would have made significantly stronger attempts to persuade these men to get married.

TABLE 25

MEAN SOCIAL PRESSURE SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MALES BY MARITAL INTENT AND RELIGION OF RESPONDENT

RELIGION OF RESPONDENT	MARITAL INTENT	MARITAL STATUS	
		MARRIED	SINGLE
PROTESTANT	TO GET MARRIED	3.93 (99)[a]	3.56 (103)
	TO STAY SINGLE	4.21 (94)	4.08 (99)
CATHOLIC	TO GET MARRIED	3.47 (157)	3.49 (152)
	TO STAY SINGLE	4.32 (153)	3.91 (151)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

Interpersonal Perceptions. The interpersonal perception scores for married and single men are presented in Table 26. Married men were

TABLE 26

MEAN INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES FOR MARRIED AND SINGLE MALES

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORE	MARITAL STATUS	
	MARRIED	SINGLE
INTELLIGENCE	4.25 (557)[a]	4.29 (554)
MATURITY	4.20 (560)	3.95*(556)
PATIENCE	4.34 (549)	4.50 (548)
UNSELFISHNESS	4.20 (552)	4.09 (548)
WARMTH	4.42 (552)	4.14*(549)
PLEASANTNESS	4.52 (553)	4.34*(546)
SATISFACTION	4.10 (553)	3.77*(547)
LUCK	4.08 (555)	3.71*(549)
HAPPINESS	4.24 (555)	3.78*(548)
PRIDE	4.41 (553)	4.14*(549)
RELIABILITY	4.17 (556)	4.12 (552)
HARDWORKING	4.45 (552)	4.24 (550)
CONSIDERATION	4.34 (550)	4.18 (546)
THOUGHTFULNESS	4.30 (555)	4.13 (544)
SECURITY	3.98 (557)	3.68*(551)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size.

* t-test, $p<.05$.

described favorably on all scales except security, while single men were described favorably on all scales except security, luck, happiness, satisfaction, and maturity. As in the case of single women, the highest score received by single men was obtained for patience.

The scores for married and single men were compared using *t*-tests. Significant differences were obtained between the means on eight of the scales. Compared to single men, married men were seen as significantly more mature, warm, pleasant, satisfied, lucky, happy, proud, and secure. Single men were not perceived to be significantly more favorable than married men on any of the fifteen scales, although single women were perceived to be significantly more favorable than married women on four scales.

DISCUSSION

MORAL JUDGMENT OF FAMILY SIZE

Families with two children received significantly more praise than families having any other number. This result is consistent with previous findings in the literature that families with two to four children are generally considered most ideal. Families with no children were also praised, while those with four children received slight blame and those with six children even more blame.

This discrepancy between the praise given to childless families in the present study and the rejection of childless families in prior studies may be a result of either changes in attitudes that have occurred in recent years or differences in methods of measurement.

According to data obtained during the 1974 Current Population Survey, the average number of children in families with a husband under 35 years of age was 1.9 compared to 2.2 in 1969 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1975). The number of married couples who were childless increased from 24 percent in 1969 to 28 percent in 1974, while the number of couples with four or more children decreased from 10 percent in 1969 to 5 percent in 1974. These findings by the Bureau of the Census strongly suggest that attitudes toward family size have changed markedly during the last five years. Therefore it is not surprising to find greater praise given for families with no children than to families having either four or six children.

Since the method used to collect data during the present study differed from those used to collect data on family-size norms in the past, differences in the reactions to families with no children could

also have been a result of these methodological differences. It is possible that respondents are willing to praise families with no children, although they themselves would not want to be childless. In essence, the respondent may be tolerant of childless families and judge them favorably even though they may consider the childless family to be highly undesirable from a personal point of view.

To determine whether the differences in reactions to childless families were due primarily to changes in attitude or to differences in method of measurement, it would be best to administer both types of measures during periods when attitudes are known to differ. An alternative method would be to give the measure used in the present study to groups known to differ in attitudes toward family size. If these groups are found to differ in their judgments of childless families, this would suggest that the praise given to childless families is a result of changes in attitude rather than to differences in method. This opportunity exists within the present study since participants included both Catholics and Protestants. Based on the findings by Westoff and Potvin (1967) that Catholics prefer larger families than Protestants, it would be expected that Catholics would ascribe less praise to childless families than Protestants. Since a significant difference was obtained between the moral judgment of Catholics and Protestants for childless families, it is likely that the greater acceptance of childless families in the present study, compared to previous studies, was a function of attitude change.

Especially noteworthy is the contrast between the positive moral judgments of childless families in the present study and the finding by

Griffith (1973) that 100 percent of her sample believed having no children makes a family too small. While Griffith's findings would appear to suggest that strong negative attitudes exist toward childless families, the contrast between the results of the two studies may be more artifactual than real. Respondents in the present study were free to ascribe any amount of blame to any size family. In the survey by Griffith, respondents were asked, "In general, what number of children do you think makes a family too small?" Phrasing the question in this manner would make it very difficult for respondents to indicate that no children are in fact quite acceptable.

An especially interesting contrast in the present study was the discrepancy between the moral judgments given families in the stories dealing with family size, and the moral judgments given families of the same size in the stories dealing with the desire for an additional child. Since the families described in the stories concerning the desire for another child were in fact expecting another child, the family with one child was comparable in size to the family with two children in the family size stories. Yet, the family described as having two children in the family size stories was highly praised, while the one child family expecting another child was blamed. Similarly, the family described as having four children in the family size stories received just slight blame, while the family with three children but expecting a fourth was blamed considerably.

One of the major differences between the two sets of stories concerned motives. No specific motive was given in the family size stories to explain why a family had a given number of children. Only the income,

wife's work status, and their confidence in science were presented. However, the motive for having an additional child was specified -- families were expecting another child because of their desire for a child of the opposite sex. It is possible, therefore, that the greater amount of blame that was ascribed to families expecting an additional child was due to a rejection of this motive by the respondents.

More likely, however, is the possiblity that the differences in judgments were due to differences in the specific actions that were being judged. In the family size stories, respondents judged each family for having a specified number of children. In the stories concerned with the desire for an additional child, the respondents were asked to judge each family for having another child.

Among the factors possibly affecting moral judgments of family size, income was found to have the strongest effect. While it was expected that high income families would receive more blame than low income families for having no children, families with no children were praised rather than blamed. Moreover, the amount of praise was unaffected by the income of the family being judged. However, income did have an effect on the judgments of families with two children. Despite the fact that families at all income levels were praised for having two children, those earning $10,000 and $16,000 were praised more than those earning only $6,000. While families earning $10,000 and $16,000 were praised for having four children, families earning only $6,000 were blamed for having this number of children. All families with six children were blamed for having this number of children, but those earning $6,000 were blamed more than those earning $16,000.

Similar effects for income were found in the portion of the study dealing with the desire for an additional child. Low income families with one child were blamed for having another child, but high income families were praised. Similarly, high income families with two children received higher moral judgment scores for having another child than low income families. Income also had an effect on judgments of families with three children, but only if the three children were girls. Low income families with three daughters were blamed more than high income families with three daughters for having an additional child. While the low income families with four children received more blame than the high income families for having an additional child, the difference in blame was not significant.

The effects of income on moral judgment were consistent with the observations reported in a review of the literature by Terhune (1975) dealing with the actual and expected consequences of family size. Terhune concluded that finances were the most salient perceived attribute of having children. Thus, the major advantage of small families over large families was viewed to be the financial advantages presented to the smaller family. As a corollary to this observation, it would be expected that families having higher incomes be praised more than those with smaller incomes for having a specified number of children. Those with the higher income could more easily afford to raise these children than those with smaller incomes.

In the study dealing with the desire for an additional child, the effects of income became less pronounced as the number of children in the family increased. With four children, the difference in moral judgment due to income was no longer statistically significant. While

it is possible that the effect no longer occurred with families having four children due to a feeling that families should have no more than three children regardless of income, this failure to find an effect for income among families with four children may have been due to the modest income figure selected to represent the higher income level. An income of $16,000 may not have been considered adequate at the time of data collection to support a family with four or more children. If a higher income level had been used in the stories, it is possible that income would have continued to have an effect even in families with four or more children.

Recent changes in the sex-role of women led to the expectation that the wife's work status would effect moral judgments of family size. Not only are more women employed today than in the past, Glick (1975) has reported that a higher proportion of women in the labor force are childless than those not in the labor force. For example, among women who are between 20 and 24 years of age, 56 percent of those employed are childless compared to only 22 percent of those who are unemployed.

Despite any changes that may have recently occurred in the sex-role of women, work status was not found to affect moral judgments. Families with working wives were praised no more for being childless than families with non-working wives. Similarly, families with working wives were blamed no more for having six children than families with non-working wives.

This failure to obtain a significant effect for wife's work status may be due to tendency to see the woman's role as a worker to be quite compatible with her role as a mother. By either delaying the birth of

the first child or delaying employment, a wife can be both a mother and work outside the home. Although she would not perform both roles simultaneously, she would be able to accomplish both within her lifetime. If so, employment would not lead to an expectation that the family be childless or even that it be limited only to one or two children. There would still be sufficient time to raise a family after a period of employment, or to seek employment after the family has been raised.

Confidence in science was also found to have no effects on moral judgments of family size. Those who believed that science would solve problems caused by population growth were blamed no less for having large families than those who did not believe that science would solve these problems. While this factor was found not to influence moral judgments, it may nevertheless have an effect on moral judgments. However, it would be the respondent's confidence in science that possibly would affect the judgments, not the confidence of the family being judged. Respondents who have high confidence in science may tend to ascribe less blame to others for having large families than is ascribed by respondents who do not have confidence in science. This hypothesis could not be tested, however, because the confidence of the respondents was not measured during the study.

In the stories dealing with the desire for an additional child, it was expected that the sex of the present children would affect moral judgments. In particular, because of the general desire in our society to have a son, it was expected that families with just daughters would be blamed less for having an additional child than families with just sons. No such effect was found, however.

In a study by Myers and Roberts (1968) dealing with preferences for different family sizes, it was found that sex balance was an important factor in determining these preferences. The most preferred combinations of boys and girls were families with two boys and two girls and those with one boy and one girl. In light of this finding, the respondents in the present study would have been expected to consistently praise families with one child who were expecting a second child because of their desire for an opposite sex child. While families earning $16,000 were praised for having an additional child, those earning $6,000 were not praised. If balance is a significant factor in moral judgments of family size, it apparently is less important than income.

The sex of the respondent did not affect the judgments of families with different numbers of children described in the family size stories. Nor did male and female respondents differ in their judgments of families for having an additional child when family size is held constant. However, there was a tendency among women to be more critical of families expecting another child if the family had three or four children already. While male respondents were also critical of the families with three children, they were less critical of those with four children.

A somewhat unexpected finding was the greater tolerance of large families among the youngest group of respondents. In the family size portion of the study, there were no differences in judgments of families with no children or two children as a consequence of age. However, 16-17 year old respondents praised families with four children, while the older groups of respondents blamed these families. Respondents of all ages

tended to blame families with six children, but the 16-17 year old respondents blamed them least. Similar findings were obtained in the portion of the study dealing with the desire for an additional child. Respondents who were just 16-17 years of age ascribed less blame than older respondents to families for having an additional child. While the judgments of those in the youngest group were not affected by the number of children in the family, older respondents showed a tendency to blame families with more than one child.

One possible explanation for the greater tolerance of large families among 16-17 year old respondents stems from the disproportionately high number of Catholics in the 16-17 year old group. Since Catholics were found to attribute less blame to large families than Protestants, the 16-17 year old group of respondents, containing proportionately more Catholics, could also be expected to ascribe less blame to large families. If the effects of age on moral judgment were merely due to disproportionate numbers of Catholics and Protestants among the three age groups, then a significant interaction would be expected between family size, age, and religion. Unfortunately, the limitations in the number of cells that the computer program could handle caused separate analyses of variance to be conducted for age and religion in the family size portion of the study. Thus, there would be no way to determine whether or not the predicted interaction actually occurred. However, all three factors were included in a single analysis of variance in the portion of the study dealing with the desire for an additional child. This interaction was not statistically significant suggesting that the effects of age were independent of the effects of religion.

It was intitally assumed that the youngest group of respondents would be least tolerant of large families because of a greater awareness of the ecological consequences of population growth. Because of the manner in which the sample was obtained, this assumption cannot be considered valid. Most 18-19 year old respondents were recruited from colleges and universities in Louisville, Kentucky. This group would probably be more aware of the consequences of population growth than the younger group recruited primarily from high schools. Furthermore, the oldest group of respondents was recruited from colleges and universities or from local churches. Since the churches in the Louisville area were sponsoring a community-wide program to aid local victims of hunger, they too were probably more aware of the consequences of population growth than the younger sample. Thus, the basis for the predictions may have been valid, but the method of recruiting respondents may have led to a reversal in outcome. The youngest group, not the oldest group, was most tolerant of large families.

The effects of religion on moral judgment were as expected. Protestants praised childless families more than Catholics, and blamed families with four or six children more than Catholics. Catholics also ascribed less blame to families for having an additional child. In the stories dealing with the desire for an additional child, the interaction between number of children and religion was not statistically significant. This indicates that differences in moral judgment due to religion were the same for families with different numbers of children.

Both the number of children wanted by the respondents and the number expected affected moral judgments of both family size and the decision to have another child. Families with no children were praised more by respondents wanting or expecting none of their own than by respondents wanting or expecting 3-4 children or five or more children. However, this pattern was reversed for judgments of large families. Families with four children were praised by those wanting many or expecting many children of their own, but they were blamed by those wanting or expecting no children, or just 1-2 children. Even families with six children were praised by those wanting or expecting five children of their own, but they were strongly blamed by respondents wanting or expecting no children or just 1-2 children. In the stories dealing with the decision to have another child, the respondents who wanted or expected at least five children of their own were the only group of respondents that did not blame any of the families for having another child. As the number of children wanted or expected increased, the less blame was given to families for having an additional child, regardless of the number of children in the families described.

Before accepting the conclusion that judgments of family size are affected by values of the respondent toward family size, the possibility should be considered that the finding is merely an artifact. Measures of number of children wanted, number of children expected, and moral judgment were paper-and-pencil measures obtained from a single booklet at one particular period of time. Since the measures of children wanted and children expected were contained in the Biographical Information

Questionnaire at the end of the booklet, responses to these questions could have been influenced by the moral judgments the respondents made earlier in the booklet. Respondents may have attempted to maintain a consistent pattern of response by basing their reports of number of children wanted and expected on their moral judgments of families with different numbers of children.

If it is assumed that the experiences with children affect the values of the judge, then evidence can be found in the present study to substantiate the validity of the relationship between values toward family size and moral judgments. Clausen and Clausen (1973) report evidence to support such an assumption in their conclusion that there is a positive relationship between number of siblings and the number of children one later has. The generalization can be made from this that the number of siblings and the number of actual children should affect the number of children wanted and expected. In the present study, any relationship between moral judgments and number of siblings or actual children could not be artifactual. Questions pertaining to number of siblings and number of children appeared at the end of the booklet, and could not have been affected by the moral judgments made earlier since they are matters of fact, not judgments.

The data concerned with number of siblings showed that families with no children are judged more favorably by respondents having relatively few siblings, while they are judged less favorably by respondents having many siblings. At the same time, families with four or six children were blamed most by respondents from smaller families, while they were blamed least by respondents from larger families.

The data concerned with the number of actual children showed a similar pattern. Families with no children are judged more favorably by respondents having few, if any, children. These families, however, were judged least favorably by respondents having relatively large numbers of children of their own. Similarly, families with either four or six children were blamed more by respondents having few, if any, children; they were blamed less or were even praised by respondents having relatively many children of their own. While the analysis of variance conducted on the data just described showed that the interaction between family size and number of children was not statistically significant, this was probably due to the smaller sample sizes since unmarried respondents were not included in the analysis.

Number of siblings was also found to affect judgments of families for having an additional child. Respondents who had no siblings appeared to ascribe more blame to families for having another child than respondents with five or more siblings even though the Newman-Keuls test failed to show a significant difference between these judgments. Respondents with no siblings were found to ascribe significantly more blame to families with three or four children than to those with only one child. They also blamed families with four children significantly more than they blamed families with two.

Since the relationship between family size and objective measures such as number of siblings or number of children was the same as the relationship between family size and subjective measures such as number of children wanted and number of children expected, it is possible that

personal values intervened in both cases. Since respondents with few siblings or few children of their own had small families as their reference group, they would probably place a relatively high value on small families. On the other hand, since respondents with many siblings or children of their own had large families as their reference group, they would probably place a relatively high value on large families. These values would, in turn, affect both the number of children desired and the number of children expected. Those placing a high value on large families would probably desire and expect to have large families, while those placing a high value on small families would probably desire and expect to have small families. If these values intervened to influence the moral judgments made of families having different numbers of children, then the relationship was not an artifactual one.

MORAL JUDGMENT OF MARITAL STATUS

When all other factors are held constant, marital status was found to affect moral judgments of women, but not judgments of men. Women who were married were praised for being married, but were blamed for remaining single. Men were judged the same whether or not they were married. This finding suggests that marriage is incorporated more closely into the sex-role of women than of men. Thus, men were not judged in terms of the degree to which they fulfilled these role expectations, although women were judged in this manner.

Two factors were found to have especially strong effects on moral judgments -- marital intent and parental pressure. Men and women whose marital status was in accord with their intentions regarding marriage

were praised whether they were married or single. Those whose marital status was not in accord with their intentions were blamed whether they were married or single. Thus, married men and women who initially wanted to be married were praised, but those who initially wanted to be single were blamed. Similarly, single men and women who wanted to remain single were praised, but those who wanted to get married were blamed. This finding suggests that respondents placed high value on autonomy as a personal characteristic. Those persons described in the stories who were in apparent control of their own behavior were praised, while those who were not in apparent control of their behavior were blamed.

Despite the strong role of autonomy in moral judgments of marital status, the effects of sex-role were also observed. Among persons whose behaviors were consistent with their intentions (and who were therefore in control of their behavior), those who were married were praised more than those who were single. Apparently the respondents viewed autonomous behavior favorably, but they view autonomous behavior leading toward marriage even more favorably. The effects of sex-role, however, were not observed in judgments of non-autonomous behavior. The respondents ascribed no more blame to single men or women whose behaviors conflicted with their intentions than to married men or women whose behaviors conflicted.

The other factor having a strong effect on moral judgments of family size was parental pressure. Women who conformed to the pressures of their parents either by getting married or staying single were blamed, while those whose behavior was in conflict with parental pressures were praised. Thus, married women were praised if their parents wanted them to remain

single, but they were blamed if their parents wanted them to get married. Single women were praised if their parents wanted them to get married, but they were blamed if their parents wanted them to remain single. The effects of parental pressure on judgments of male marital status was also observed, but only for men who were single. Single men whose parents wanted them to get married were praised, but those whose parents wanted them to remain single were blamed.

Thus, independence from parental influence was a strong factor affecting the judgments of marital status. Just as the respondents appeared to value autonomy as a personal characteristic, they also appeared to value non-conformity to parental pressures. Thus, women who acted independently were praised, while those who did not were blamed. Independence was also viewed favorably in single men since those who acted independent of their parents' wishes were praised, and those who conformed were blamed. Independence among married men, however, did not appear to affect moral judgments.

The effects of sex-role on moral judgments of female marital status appeared in the data concerned with parental pressure just as it appeared in the data concerned with marital intent. Non-conforming women who were married were praised more than non-conforming women who were single, while conforming women who were married were blamed less than conforming women who were single.

Stability was found to affect moral judgments of married men, but not the judgments of single men. Married men who were stable were praised, while those who were not stable were blamed. Thus, the respondents appeared to feel that men who would be unable to support and

care for a family should not get married. However, since the capacity to find and keep employment would have fewer consequences for single men, those who were stable were judged no more favorably than those who were unstable.

While attractiveness of women was expected to affect moral judgments of marital status for females, no effect was obtained. Thus, marriage appears to be viewed as part of the sex-role for women whether or not they are attractive.

The sex, age, and religion of the respondent had no effects of judgments of marital status in women. While religion had no effects on moral judgments of marital status in men, age did have an effect. The respondents in the 16-17 year old group praised married men, but blamed single men. The sex of the respondent had an effect on judgments of marital status, but only in conjunction with marital intent. This interaction was complex and no clear differences were apparent in the judgments made by male and female respondents.

SOCIAL PRESSURE AND FAMILY SIZE

Although families with no children were praised, the respondents also indicated that they would have attempted to influence these families to have children. This would have been expected given the fact that families with two children were praised even more than those with none. However, once the families were described as having children, the respondents indicated that they would have attempted to influence them to have no more children. Whether or not families with one child would have received pressures to have another child cannot be determined from the data since

families with only one child were not described in any of the stories dealing with family size. Nevertheless, for the levels of family size that were represented in the stories, the amount of pressure that would have been placed upon families to have no more children increased as the number of children increased.

In the stories dealing with the desire for an additional child, when all other factors are held constant, families of all sizes would have received social pressure to have no more children including those families with only one child. The amount of social pressure that would have been placed upon these families to have no more children increased until the families had three children. Families with four children would have received no more pressure than those with three children.

Thus, in the portion of the study dealing with family size, the magnitude of social pressure was found to increase continuously with each increasing level of family size. In the portion of the study dealing with the desire for another child, the magnitude of this pressure to limit family size continued to increase only until the family had three children, In the earlier discussion of the differences in moral judgment resulting from the two different sets of stories, it was stated that the differences in moral judgment could have resulted either from the difference in the behavior being judged or from the specification of a motive in the stories dealing with the desire to have an additional child. Although there was a difference between the two sets of stories in the behavior being judged, the social pressure scales were identical in both sets. Therefore, the differences in social pressure were probably due to the particular motive for having an additional child. Apparently once a family has three children,

the desire for an additional child is no longer considered a valid reason for having children. Families with three children would then be blamed as much as those with four and would receive the same magnitude of social pressure as families with four children.

Income was the only factor affecting the direction and magnitude of social pressure for families with different numbers of children described in the stories concerned with family size. While families at all income levels having no children would receive social pressure to have a child, families earning $10,000 and $16,000 would have received stronger pressures than those earning $6,000. Families with two or four children would have received pressure to have no more children, but families earning $6,000 would have received stronger pressures than those earning $10,000 and $16,000. Thus, a bias against low income families was apparent in all stories involving families having up to four children. However, there was no difference in the magnitude of social pressure that would have been received by families at different income levels with six children. This would appear to indicate that high income is no longer a justification for having large families when families attain a particular size. Ironically, differences were obtained between the moral judgment scores of families with six children earning $6,000 and those earning $16,000, but not in the magnitude of social pressure they would receive.

While income had an effect on social pressure until family size reached four children, larger income levels could conceivably cause income to have an effect for even larger families. It cannot be determined from the data whether or not upper class families would have received strong pressures to have no more children.

Income was also found to affect the social pressures that families would have received in the stories concerned with the desire for an additional child. While high income families with one child would have received pressure to have another child, low income families with one child would have received pressure to have no more children. Low income families with two children would also have received pressure to have no more children, but virtually no attempts at all would have been made to influence high income families. Income was found to have an effect on social pressure among families with three children also, but only if these children were female. Low income families with three daughters would have received stronger pressures to have no more children than high income families with three daughters. Finally, income was found to have no effects on social pressures received by families with four children. As was observed in the portion of the study dealing with family size, within the range of income being investigated high income was no longer a justification for having large families. Even though the high income families were described as capable of supporting more children, the respondents either were skeptical of their ability to support additional children, or they felt that family size should be limited regardless of the ability to support a large family.

Neither the wife's work status nor confidence in science affected social pressures directed toward families with different numbers of children. In the stories concerned with the desire for an additional child, the sex of the children did not affect social pressures except possibly among families with three children. Income level was found to

affect social pressure for families with three daughters, but not with three sons. This indicates, perhaps, that the desire for a son was tolerated slightly more among high income families than the desire for a daughter, at least in families of intermediate size.

The sex, age, and religion of the respondent were found not to affect the amount of social pressure that would be placed upon families with different numbers of children, although they did tend to have effects on moral judgment.

SOCIAL PRESSURE AND MARITAL STATUS

Since marriage is a *fait accompli*, the social pressure scale essentially asked the respondents what they would have done before marriage took place. Their responses are therefore somewhat difficult to interpret. Respondents indicated that they would have attempted to influence both married and single women to get married, but they would have made stronger attempts to influence women who subsequently were married. While the respondents indicated also that they would have attempted to influence married men toward marriage, there would have been no attempts to influence single men toward marriage. This finding suggests that marriage plays a more important part in the sex-role of women than men.

One of the major factors affecting moral judgments of marital status was marital intent. Both married and single women were praised for autonomous behavior, but were blamed for non-autonomous behavior. The importance of autonomy was shown again by the social pressure that would have been directed toward married women. Married women who wanted

to get married would have received social pressures toward marriage, while those wanting to remain single would have received social pressures toward remaining single. For single women, autonomy seemed to be a less important factor. Single women would have received social pressures to get married whether they wanted to get married or to stay single. The magnitude of this pressure depended, however, on their attractiveness. If the single women were described as being attractive, then stronger pressures would have been placed upon them to get married when they intended to get married than when they intended to stay single. However, if the women were described as being unattractive, then they would have received the same degree of social pressure toward marriage whether or not they intended to get married.

Thus, both sex-role and autonomy appear to affect reactions toward marital status. Since married women were acting in accordance with their sex-role, autonomy was found to affect social pressures. Those wanting to get married were praised, while those wanting to remain single were blamed. Single women were not acting in accordance with their sex-roles. The social pressure to influence them to fulfill their sex-roles by getting married were sufficiently strong, apparently, to overcome the effects of autonomy in reactions to marital status. Thus single women would have received social pressures directing them toward marriage regardless of their intent to stay single or get married.

Although attractiveness did not have an effect on moral judgments of marital status, it did affect the social pressures that would be received by single women. Unattractive women would have received the

same pressure to get married whether they wanted to get married or to stay single, while attractive women who wanted to get married would have received stronger pressures than those who wanted to stay single. The respondents may have assumed that attractive single women would have little difficulty finding a husband. Therefore, social pressures on attractive women wanting to get married were apt to succeed. Consequently, stronger pressures toward marriage would be placed on single attractive women who wanted to get married than single attractive women who wanted to stay single. If the single women were unattractive, however, social pressures conceivably would have less of an effect since unattractive women would have somewhat more difficulty finding a husband. Therefore, no more pressure would have been placed on unattractive women wanting to get married than on those wanting to stay single since additional social pressure was likely to be futile.

While parental pressure was found to affect moral judgments of marital status for women, it had no effect on social pressure. Moreover, neither marital intent nor parental pressure had effects on social pressure in the stories describing male marital status. Stability also had no effect. Thus, moral judgments seem more sensitive to the effects of these factors than social pressure. Perhaps the respondents felt free to praise or blame the actions of others regarding marriage, but they may have been reluctant to try to influence their behavior.

The sex and age of the respondent were also found not to affect social pressure. Although religion did have an effect, its effect occured in interaction with other factors and could not be readily interpreted.

The number of children in a family was found to affect the manner in which the family was perceived. Compared to large families, families with no children were described as intelligent, mature, patient, and reliable. Thus, they were seen as having personal qualities consistent with a high degree of self-control. Childless families, on the other hand, received relatively low ratings on happiness, luck, unselfishness, and warmth. Thus, the childless family was not seen as a particularly happy or pleasant one. Moreover, it appeared to be seen as lacking in affection. At the other extreme, families with six children were seen as particularly warm, pleasant, and happy, but not very intelligent, thoughtful, or considerate. Thus, the large family was seen as experiencing love and happiness, but as disregarding the consequences of having a large family. Terhune (1975) found in his review of the literature on the consequences of family size that the benefits of large families were happiness and love. The results of the present study confirm this finding.

Families with two children and four children were viewed favorably on most characteristics, although families with two children were seen somewhat more favorably.

The families described in the stories dealing with the desire for an additional child were not perceived quite as favorably on most traits as those described in the stories dealing with family size. Families with one child tended to be described most favorably, although the descriptions of families with two children were also favorable. Families

with three and four children, compared to those with only one or two, were seen as unintelligent, immature, impatient, selfish, dissatisfied, inconsiderate, and unthoughtful. As was found in the stories dealing with family size, large families are seen as warm, but as disregarding the consequences of having a large family.

The lack of consideration and thoughtfulness characterising the perceptions of large families may be interpreted in two ways. The families may be seen as inconsiderate because they would be less able to provide for the family when there are more children. However, the families may be viewed as inconsiderate of society as a whole. By having this number of children, the families would be placing a burden upon society by contributing to excessive population growth.

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS OF MARITAL STATUS

The description of married and single men differed significantly on eight of the fifteen traits. Married men were viewed more favorably on all eight. They were seen as more mature, warmer, more pleasant, more satisfied, luckier, happier, prouder, and more secure than single men. The descriptions of married and single women differed signficantly on seven traits. Married women were viewed more favorably only on three of these. Married women, compared to single women, were luckier, happier, and more proud. Single women were seen as more patient, intelligent, reliable, and thoughtful.

In his role as an adult male, the man is expected to support a family in comfort. If he is single, this may be interpreted as an indication that he is not capable of fulfilling these expectations. Single

men, therefore, would be viewed less favorably than married men. But just the opposite relationship would occur in women. The normal role of a woman would place her in the home and as being dependent upon her husband. To be single and therefore self-supporting, the woman would require skills or abilities that married women would not need. Thus, single women would be perceived more favorably on these traits than married women.

SUMMARY

The results of this study have shown that families with two children receive more praise than families of other sizes. While childless families are also praised, families with more than two children receive increasing amounts of blame. Moral judgments of family size are affected by the income of the families being judged, but not by their confidence that science will solve ecological problems caused by overpopulation or by wife's work status. While income has no effects on judgments of childless families, families with high income tend to be blamed less than families with low income for having relatively large families. Younger respondents (i.e., 16-17 years of age) tend to ascribe less blame to large families than older respondents. While Protestants praise childless families more than Catholics, they also blame large families more than Catholics. Both respondent's own family size and desired family size affect moral judgments. Respondents tended to praise families similar in size to their own, and to blame families differing in size from their own. They also tended to praise families comparable in size to those they want or expect to have themselves, but tended to blame families that differed in size from those they want or expect to have.

Families having an additional child because of the desire for an opposite sex child received increasing amounts of blame as the number of children in their families increased to three, but not as the number of children increased beyond three. Moral judgments were affected by family income, but not the sex of the children. High income families with one or

two children tended to be praised for having another child, while low income families with this number of children are blamed. Income affected the judgments of families with three daughters, but not those with three sons, and had no effect on judgments of families with four children. Respondents from large families and respondents desiring or expecting large families judged families more favorably for having another child than respondents from small families and respondents desiring or expecting small families.

Although married women were praised and single women were blamed, marital status did not by itself affect moral judgments received by men. Moral judgments of marital status for both men and women were affected by marital intent. Marital behavior that was consistent with intentions were praised, while marital behavior that contradicted intentions were blamed. Women who conformed to parental pressures were blamed, while those who did not conform were praised. While single men were praised for not conforming to parental pressure and blamed for conforming, parental pressure did not affect moral judgments of married men. Married men who were stable were praised, while those who were unstable were blamed for getting married. Stability did not affect moral judgments of single men. Attractiveness had no effect on moral judgments of the marital status of women.

Sex and religion of respondent did not affect moral judgments of marital status. Age of respondent had no effect on moral judgments of women, but 16-17 year old respondents tended to praise married men for getting married and blame single men for remaining single.

While respondents would have applied social pressure to influence childless families to have children, families with more than two children would receive increasingly strong social pressures to have no more children. Social pressures are influenced by income, but not by wife's work status or the family's confidence in science. High income childless families would receive stronger pressures than low income childless families to have children, but low income families with two or four children would receive stronger pressures than high income families with two or four children to have no more children. Income level did not effect amount of social pressure received by families with six children.

Families having an additional child would receive increasingly strong pressure to have no more children as number of children increased to three, but not as the number of children increased to four. Income, but not sex of children, affected social pressure. High income families with one child would receive pressure to have another, but low income families would receive no pressure. High income families with two children would receive no pressure, but low income families with two children would receive pressure to have no more children. Income affected social pressure for families with three children only if the children are girls. Stronger pressure to have no more children would have been placed on the low income family with three daughters. Income had no effect on social pressure for families with four children.

Social pressure received by married and single men was not affected by stability, marital intent, or parental pressure. Married women who intended to stay single would have received pressure to remain single, but those intending to get married would have received pressure to get married.

Single women, if attractive, would receive stronger pressures toward marriage if they intended to get married than if they intended to stay single, but intent did not affect social pressure received by single women who were unattractive. Parental pressure did not affect social pressure received by married or single women.

Sex and age of respondent did not affect social pressure for married and unmarried men or women. Religion had an effect in interaction with other factors.

Families with two children were perceived more favorably than families with any other number of children, although families with four children were also perceived very favorably. Families with no children were seen as patient and intelligent, but also as lacking in warmth and happiness. Families with no children were seen also as less lucky and less proud than other families. Families with six children were seen as pleasant and happy, but as relatively less considerate and less thoughtful. Families with six children were also seen as less intelligent and less mature.

Families with one or two children that were having an additional child were described favorably on most scales. Families with three or four children were seen as warm and pleasant, but as inconsiderate and unthoughtful. They were also seen as immature and lacking in intelligence.

Compared to single women, married women were perceived as lucky, happy, and proud, but compared to married women, single women are viewed as patient, reliable, thoughtful and intelligent. Married men were consistently viewed more favorably than single men.

The results of the present study indicate that small families, including those with no children, are praised more than large families.

The favorable reactions obtained by families with no children, in contrast to findings from previous research, may be due either to changes in value or to differences in research method. Moral judgments of family size appeared to be affected primarily by financial considerations and by the values of the respondent. These same factors affected moral judgments of families for having an additional child. Judgments of marital status were affected primarily by autonomy and non-conformity. Both married and single persons tended to be praised for acting in accordance with their own intentions and for remaining independent of parental pressures. While social pressures directed toward families with different numbers of children were affected primarily by family size and income, the factors affecting moral judgment of marital status had less of an effect on social pressure. Respondents were apparently less willing to influence behavior than to judge it. Families with no children were seen as lacking in warmth; while large families were perceived as being warm, they were also seen as inconsiderate and unthoughtful. Respondents apparently felt that parents having large families did not care about the consequences of family size either on their own children or on society as a whole. Single women, compared to married women, were seen as having several favorable traits. Behavior deviating from the woman's sex role apparently was interpreted as being the result of special skills or traits such as intelligence and reliability. Married men were consistently judged more favorably than single men. Behavior deviating from the male's sex role apparently is interpreted as indicating lack of desirable skills or traits.

REFERENCES

Asch, S. E. "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," in H. Guetzkow (ed.), *Groups, Leadership, and Men*, Carnegie Press, Pittsburgh, 1951, pp. 177-190.

Clausen, J. A., and Clausen, S. R. "The Effects of Family Size on Parents and Children," in J. T. Fawcett (ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on Population*, Basic Books, New York, 1973, pp. 185-208.

Festinger, L. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Row, Peterson, Evanston, Illinois, 1957.

George, E. I. "Research on Measurement of Family-Size Norms," in J. T. Fawcett (ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on Population*, Basic Books, New York, 1973, pp. 354-370.

Glick, P. C. "Some Recent Changes in American Families," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-23, No. 52, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1975.

Griffith, J. "Social Pressure on Family Size Intentions," *Family Planning Perspectives*, vol. 5, 1973, pp. 237-242.

Hoffman, L. W. and Hoffman, M. L. "The Value of Children to Parents," in J. T. Fawcett (ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on Population*, Basic Books, New York, 1973, pp. 19-76.

Kohlberg, L. "The Development of Children's Orientation Toward a Moral Order: I. Sequence in the Development of Moral Thought," *Vita Humana*, vol. 6, 1963, pp. 11-33.

Mauldin, W. P., Watson, W. B., and Noe, L. F. *KAP Surveys and Evaluations of Family Planning Programmes*, Population Council (mimeo), New York, 1970.

Myers, G. C., and Roberts, J. M. "A Technique for Measuring Preferential Family Size and Composition," *Eugenics Quarterly*, vol. 15, 1968, pp. 164-172.

Nobbe, C. E. and Okkraku, I. O. "Male-Female Differences in Family Size Preferences Among College Students," *Social Biology*, vol. 21, 1974, pp. 279-289.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, P. H. *The Measurement of Meaning*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, 1957.

Piaget, J. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1948 (originally published, 1932).

Ridley, J. C. "Number of Children Expected in Relation to Non-Familial Activities of the Wife," *Milbank Memorial Quarterly*, vol. 37, 1959, pp. 277-296.

Ryder, N. B. and Westoff, C. F. *Reproduction in the United States: 1965*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1971.

Shultz, L. T. and Dillehay, R. C. "Effort and Incidental Outcome as Factors in Moral Judgment," Paper presented at the Southwestern Psychological Association, April 1970.

Terhune, K. W. *A Review of the Actual and Expected Consequences of Family Size*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, Publication No. (NIH) 75-779, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 276, "Household and Family Characteristics: March 1974," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Westoff, C. F. and Potvin, R. H. *College Women and Fertility Values*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967.

APPENDIX

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCALE

INTELLIGENT	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	UNINTELLIGENT
IMMATURE	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	MATURE
PATIENT	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	IMPATIENT
SELFISH	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	UNSELFISH
WARM	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	COLD
UNPLEASANT	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	PLEASANT
DISSATISFIED	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	SATISFIED
LUCKY	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	UNLUCKY
HAPPY	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	UNHAPPY
ASHAMED	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	PROUD
UNRELIABLE	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	RELIABLE
LAZY	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	HARDWORKING
INCONSIDERATE	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	CONSIDERATE
THOUGHTLESS	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	THOUGHTFUL
SECURE	:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:	INSECURE

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions.

1. Are you male or female?

   _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. How old were you on your last birthday?

   _____ years

3. When were you born?

   _____
   Month Day Year

4. What is your marital status?

   _____ Single
   _____ Married
   _____ Separated
   _____ Divorced
   _____ Widowed

5. If you are not now married, do you plan to get married someday?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   _____ I am already married

6. If you are a parent, how many children do you have?

   _____ children

(BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE, Cont'd.)

7. In what type of school are you enrolled?

_____ I am not enrolled in school
_____ High school
_____ College
_____ Other (such as technical school or night school)

8. If you are not enrolled in school, in what grade or year are you?

_____

9. Have you ever thought about the number of children you want?

_____ Yes
_____ No

10. How many children do you want to have as a parent?

_____

11. How many children do you think you will have as a parent?

_____

12. How many years of education has your mother or the woman who raised you completed?

_____ 8th grade or less
_____ Some high school
_____ High school graduate
_____ Some college
_____ College graduate
_____ Graduate or professional school

13. How many years of education has your father or the man who raised you completed?

_____ 8th grade or less
_____ Some high school
_____ High school graduate
_____ Some college
_____ College graduate
_____ Graduate or professional school

14. What was the approximate combined yearly income of your parents or the persons who raised you when you were about 12-14 years old?

_____ Less than $3,500
_____ From $3,500 to $6,000
_____ From $6,000 to $10,000
_____ From $10,000 to $16,000
_____ From $16,000 to $25,000
_____ From $25,000 to $50,000
_____ Above $50,000

15. About what year was that?

_____

16. How did this income compare with that of most people in the community you live in when you were growing up?

_____ It was higher
_____ It was about the same
_____ It was lower

17. What major city did you live in or near most of the time when you were growing up?

_____

18. Where did you live most of the time when you were growing up?

_____ In a city of 100,000 people or more
_____ In a city of 50,000 to 100,000 people
_____ In a city with a population under 50,000
_____ In a rural area (not in a city)

19. What religious preference do you have?

_____ Protestant
_____ Catholic
_____ Jewish
_____ None
_____ Other *(Please specify* _____*)*

20. If your religious preference is Protestant, what denomination do you prefer?

_____ Baptist
_____ Christian
_____ Church of God
_____ Episcopal
_____ Lutheran
_____ Methodist
_____ Presbyterian
_____ Other *(Please specify* _____*)*

21. How many brothers did you have in your family?

_____

22. How many sisters did you have in your family?

_____